

THE  
CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. XI. — SEPTEMBER, 1871. — No. 61.

ARTICLE I.

RELIGION ACCORDING TO CARLYLE.\*

In "Harper's New Monthly Magazine" for January, 1863, is an article on "Carlyle's Table-talk," as reported by Rev. Mr. Milburn, the "Blind Preacher," which may furnish a clue to the origin and religious import of the enigmatic and remarkable work the title of which we have given.

We will give several extracts from the "Table-talk," relating to the religious history of Carlyle. According to Mr. Milburn, he thus speaks of his father and his minister :

"I think of all the men I have ever known, my father was quite the remarkablest. Quite a farmer sort of a person, using vigilant thrift and careful husbandry ; — abiding by veracity and faith, and with an extraordinary insight into the very heart of things and men.

"He was an elder of the kirk ; and it was very pleasant to see him in his daily and weekly relations with the minister of the parish. They had been friends from their youth, and had grown up together in the service of their common Master. The parish minister was the first person that taught me Latin ; and I am not sure but that he laid a great curse upon me in so doing.

"It was a pleasant thing to see the minister, in cassock and bands, come

\*SARTOR RESARTUS : The Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdröckh. In three books. By Thomas Carlyle.

forth on the Sabbath day and stand up to lead the devotions of his people — preaching to them the words of truth and soberness which he had gained by pains-taking study and devout prayer to Almighty God to know what was the mind of the Spirit; not cutting fantastic capers before high Heaven, as is the wont and use of many of you modern preachers, seeking to become Thaumaturgists in gathering a crowd of gaping fools to behold — sad spectacle! — how much of a fool a man could be in the sight of God. There was none of your so called Popular Oratory, and astonishing vocal gymnastics styled Eloquence — wonderful to gods and men; but only a simple and earnest desire to feed the souls of his people and lead them in the ways of life everlasting. It was pleasant indeed to see my father and his minister together, and to hear their grave and serious talk. You would be satisfied that whoever was out of his duty they were in theirs.”

And he indulges in the following strain in referring to the death of his father :

“I had not been in town many days when the heavy tidings came that my father was dead. He had gone to bed at night as well as usual it seemed; but they found in the morning that he had passed from the realm of Sleep to that of Day. It was a fit end for such a life as his had been. Ah, sir, he was a man into the four corners of whose house there had shined, through the years of his pilgrimage by day and by night, the light of the glory of God. Like Enoch of old he had walked with God, and at the last he was not, for God took him. If I could only see such men now as were my father and his minister — men of such fearless truth and simple faith — with such firmness in holding on to the things that they believed; in saying and doing only what they thought was right; in seeing and hating the thing that they felt to be wrong — I should have far more hope for this British nation, and indeed for the world at large.”

Thus Carlyle was signally favored with an early religious education under the direction of a most remarkable and godly father and excellent and earnest minister.

In answer to Mr. Milburn's inquiries in relation to the origin of the dyspepsia, from which he suffers, we have the following significant and strange disclosures :

“I am sure I can hardly tell, sir,” replied Carlyle. “I only know that for the one or two or three and twenty years of my mortal existence, I am not conscious of the ownership of that diabolical arrangement called a Stomach. I had grown up a healthy and hardy son of a hardy and healthy Scotch dalesman: and he was the descendant of a long line of such: men that had tilled their paternal acres, and gained their threescore years and ten — or even mayhap, by reason of strength, their fourscore years — and

had gone down to their graves, never a man of them the wiser for the possession of this infernal apparatus. I had gone through the University of Edinburgh, and had been invited by an old friend to become associated with him in the conduct of a school. He was a man, sir, whose name you may have heard upon your own side of the waters. It was Edward Irving — my old friend Edward Irving.

"To Kirkcaldy I went. Together we talked and wrought and thought — together we strove, by virtue of birch and of book, to initiate the urchins into what is called the Rudiments of Learning; until at length the hand of the Lord was laid upon him, and the voice of his God spake to him, saying 'Arise and get thee hence; for this is not thy rest!' And he arose, and girded up his loins, and putting the trumpet of the Almighty to his lips, he blew such a blast as that men started in strange surprise, and said that the like had not been heard since the days of the Covenant itself.

\* \* \* \* \*

"And I tarried the while yonder at Kirkcaldy, endeavoring still to initiate the urchins into the Rudiments of Learning, until the voice spake unto me, saying, 'Arise and settle now the problem of thy life.' I had been destined by my father and my father's minister to be myself a minister of the Kirk of Scotland. But now that I had gained the years of man's estate, I was not sure that I believed the doctrines of my father's kirk; and it was needful that I should now settle it. And so I entered into my chamber, and closed the door. And around about me there came a trooping throng of phantasms dire, from the abysmal depths of nethermost perdition. Doubt, Fear, Unbelief, Mockery, and Scoffing were there; and I wrestled with them in the travail and agony of spirit. Thus was it, sir, for many weeks. Whether I ate I know not; whether I drank I know not; whether I slept I know not. But I only know that when I came forth again beneath the glimpses of the moon, it was with the direful persuasion that I was the miserable owner of a diabolical apparatus called a Stomach. And I never have been free from that knowledge from that hour to this; and I suppose that I never shall be until I am laid away in my grave.'

It may be that here is a key to unlock the mystery of Herr Teufelsdröckh. Carlyle was born in 1795. Consequently it was some time previous to 1818 that he retired to his chamber to settle the problem of his life. "Sartor Resartus" first appeared in "Fraser's Magazine" in 1833-4 — some fifteen years after this great spiritual crisis. Its ostensible object is, partly, to represent Teufelsdröckh's views of the difference between the forms and outside of things, and the things themselves, under the quaint designation of "The Philosophy of Clothes," and, in part, to unfold the spiritual biography of the hero, and describe the process by which he came to embrace

such views. The latter, we are inclined to think, was the principal motive of Carlyle. The work is a psychological biography, tracing with abrupt but vivid descriptions the several stages of struggle of a great and thoughtful mind in settling the questions of its destiny, — with parentheses and addenda containing the opinions of the hero.

Probably few have read "*Sartor Resartus*" without the suggestion occurring to them that it was *autobiographical*, and that Carlyle was revealing his own spiritual history to some extent in it. This impression is rendered much more probable by the extracts we have made from the "*Table-talk*." The distance of time of the tragic events in the chamber suits the handling of them in authorship. There is a deep impulse in one who has passed through any severe spiritual struggle, and come out, as he supposes, into victory and light, when the smart of the contest is over, to describe the process to others. Then there are several points of coincidence between the hero and the author. Both had a religious education. Both at the early part of their career taught and translated and wrote anonymously for subsistence. Teufelsdröckh's opinions on all sorts of subjects correspond with Carlyle's, as elsewhere expressed. Carlyle's account of the crisis in his own history, given to Milburn in a few words, is identical in spirit with that of his hero, given in full in "*Sartor Resartus*." He even intimates in the latter work that there may be some interior connection between the two. He says, "*Teufelsdröckh is our riend, Truth is our divinity.*" (p. 9.) And to end all, he gives Teufelsdröckh the dyspepsia, in these words: "A prey incessantly to such corrosions, might not, moreover, as the worst aggravation to them, the iron constitution even of a Teufelsdröckh threaten to fail? We conjecture that he has known sickness; and in spite of his *locomotive* habits, perhaps sickness of the *chronic* sort." (p. 74.) Of course, when the object is the delineation of spiritual struggles, we should look for spiritual identity only, not for identity in outward history, and we should expect in the latter as wide dissimilarity as possible, and agreement only in those external particulars



which become essential to the inner history. Carlyle evidently designs to hide the real personality under most grotesque, fragmentary and impenetrable externals; but this only makes the spiritual identity the more noteworthy.

Now, whether — to adopt the figure which furnishes the formal idea of the book — if we throw aside from “Sartor Resartus” everything which is of the nature of *clothes*, and get down to the real idea and substance, we shall there find it to be a genuine spiritual autobiography of Thomas Carlyle or not, certain it is that no one would ever think of writing such a work but from the suggestions and promptings of experience. In either case, it must be regarded as reflecting or hinting the interior history of the author.

We do not care about pressing further the point that the book is substantially, in its inner core, autobiographical, and Herr Teufelsdröckh, apart from his “clothes,” is Thomas Carlyle. It is our purpose to gather out from the multiform, confused, and often turbid contents of the work, the indications of one line, and one line only, of the great spiritual struggle described in it, viz.: *the Religious*. It is worth while to know how such a thinker as Carlyle, when he goes to his chamber, and shuts himself in, settles the problem of life, and answers the claims of Christianity and of God; and if he settles the problem wrong, as we believe, and abandons the Christian faith that was early taught him, as we know, there must be something instructive, as well as awfully grand and sad, in the successive acts of such a tragedy.

Teufelsdröckh’s training in childhood was religious, but also strict and authoritative; and he complains: “I was forbid much — wishes in any measure bold I had to renounce; everywhere a strait hand of obedience inflexibly held me down.” (p. 45.)\* In the University his teachers “were hide-bound Pedants, without knowledge of man’s nature or of boys; or of aught save their lexicons and quarterly account-books,” (p. 48,) and there was such talk about Progress, and

\* We quote from a cheap — two shillings — edition, published by Saxton & Miles, in 1844.

the like, "that all were quickly enough blown out into a state of windy argumentativeness; whereby the better sort must soon end in sick, impotent Skepticism; the worser sort explode in finished self-conceit, and to all spiritual intents become dead." (p. 52.) It was here, under the influence of shallow and eyeless teaching, but with a mind that was beginning to think for itself, and to devour eagerly all books, that the skeptical tendency first shows itself, encountering, however, as it seems, strong opposition from his early religious impressions. "Teufelsdröckh gives us long details," the editor writes in relation to his University life, "of his 'fever-paroxysms of Doubt,' his inquiries concerning Miracles, and the evidences of Religious Faith; and how 'in the silent night-watches, still darker in his heart than over sky and earth, he has cast himself before the All-seeing, and with audible prayers, cried vehemently for Light, for deliverance from Death and the Grave.'" (p. 53.) Here is the beginning of the conflict. On the one hand, we must see his early training, conscience, the Spirit of God; on the other, the riot and license of newborn thought, without adequate human guidance or sympathy, the discovery that some of the forms and arguments in which he had hitherto conceived of Christianity were erroneous, and must fall, and inability at the moment to distinguish between the divine reality and those forms, and thus save the one while he modifies the other. It is always a trying period when the Gospel, in the diminutive and imperfect form in which it has unavoidably been received by a child, comes to be interrogated by the daring, inquisitive, independent, deeper-seeing mind of a young man just shaking off the delusions of youth, and intoxicated by the new and adverse positions of science and criticism. Teufelsdröckh is in it, and under disadvantages. The good in him does not gain the victory. His prayers are not answered. He does not find the "Light," nor "deliverance from Death and the Grave."

The struggle, as Carlyle describes it, becomes a bitter and long agony, waxing worse and worse, till it reaches the stage which he calls "*The Everlasting No.*" "A strange contradic-

tion lay in me," Teufelsdröckh remarks, "and I as yet knew not the solution of it." (p. 58.)

We think, moreover, Carlyle himself never quite understood the struggle; or if gleams of the truth flashed into his mind at the time, the result to which he came led him subsequently entirely to misconceive its character. In our judgment the conflict was essentially between the Spirit of God and self-will; and it was the unwillingness and inability to bow humbly to the will of God, accept the Gospel, and trust and serve the Saviour, that was the ground and explanation of the doubt and denials. The difficulty was moral and spiritual, radically in that great mystery of our being, the free will, though it was largely carried on in the speculative arena. Hence, while we look to Carlyle for the facts, we can not look to him for their interpretation, but must see under them the conflict of the Spirit of God and the self-will and pride of the heart.

Looking at this stage of the history in this light, the description is exceedingly significant. See how the awakened, disturbed soul tries to conceal its trouble, and ward off its spiritual annoyances. "The seemingly ironic tone I had adopted, as my favorite dialect in conversation. Alas! the panoply of Sarcasm was but a buckram case, wherein I have striven to envelope myself; that so my own poor Person might live safe there; and in all friendship, being no longer exasperated by wounds." (p. 59.) See also how vividly the unsatisfactory nature of all wordly good and employment to one whose soul is awakened to feel its spiritual need, but does not accept the true supply, is described: "A nameless unrest urged me forward; to which the outward motion was some momentary lying solace. Whither should I go? My Load-stars were blotted out; in that canopy of grim fire shone no star. Yet forward must I; the ground burnt under me; there was no rest for the sole of my foot. I was alone, alone! Ever too the strong inward longing shaped Fantasms for itself — towards these, one after the other, I must fruitlessly wander. A feeling I had that, for my fever-thirst, there was and must

be a healing Fountain. To many fondly imagined Fountains, the Saints' Wells of these days, did I pilgrim ; to great Men, to great Cities, to great Events — but found there no healing. In strange countries, as in the well known ; in savage deserts as in the press of corrupt civilization, it was ever the same — how could your Wanderer escape from — *his own shadow* ? (p. 70.) No better description, again, could be given of the sense of loneliness which oppresses and chills one in this condition, than the following : " Invisible yet impenetrable walls, as of Enchantment, divided me from all living — was there in the wide world any true bosom I could press trustfully to mine ? O Heaven, No, there was none ! I kept a lock upon my lips. \* \* \* The men and women around me, even speaking with me, were but Figures." (p. 74.) Meanwhile, like any other person under similar circumstances, he wants to have some outward thing pointed out for him to do, instead of submitting his heart to Christ and being saved by grace. " Had a divine Messenger from the clouds or miraculous Handwriting on the wall, convincingly proclaimed to me, *This shalt thou do*, with what passionate readiness, as I often thought, would I have done it, had it been leaping into the infernal fire ! " (p. 73.)

His condition is now one of utmost spiritual wretchedness, and betrays the strange mingling of desperation and undefined fear which is experienced by those who, being held back by self-will, but convicted of duty by the Spirit, are the subjects of a long-continued and powerful controversy between the two. Mark the confession : " Having no hope, neither had I any definite fear, were it of Man or Devil — nay, I often felt as if it might be solacing, could the Arch-Devil himself, though in Tartarean terrors, but rise to me, that I might tell him a little of my mind. And yet, strangely enough, I lived in a continual, indefinite, pining fear ; tremulous, pusillanimous, apprehensive of I knew not what ; it seemed as if all things in the Heavens above and the Earth beneath would hurt me ; as if the Heavens and the Earth were but boundless

Jaws of a devouring Monster, wherein I, palpitating, waited to be devoured." (p. 75.)

So far he has made no progress in the right direction. "Doubt," as Carlyle reports the struggle, "has darkened into unbelief. Shade after shade goes grimly over the soul, till he has the fixed, starless, Tartarean black," and he even questions God's existence. But his misery has kept equal pace with his misbelief and denials. The thought of suicide is suggested, but is arrested by the influence of the very thing following him from childhood, which he fancies all a delusion, and the pretensions of which he affects to scorn or ignore. "From suicide a certain *after-shine of Christianity* withheld me; perhaps also a certain indolence of character; for, was not that a remedy I had at any time within reach? Often, however, was there a question to me — Should some one now, at the turning of that corner, blow me suddenly out of Space, into the other World, by pistol shot, — *how were it*?" (p. 74.)

We come now to the crisis — what Teufelsdröckh speaks of as his "Spiritual New-birth," or "Conversion," but what seems to us, rather, the grave of a great soul. It makes us shudder to approach it. That it may be clearly seen how Carlyle attempts to allay the sense of guilt and need in the disturbed soul, and gain spiritual rest, we will quote the passage entire :

"Full of such humor, and perhaps the miserablest man in the whole French Capital or suburbs, was I, one sultry dog-day, after much perambulation, toiling along the dirty little Rue Saint Thomas de l'Enfer, among civic rubbish enough in a close atmosphere, and over pavements hot as Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, whereby doubtless my spirits were little cheered; when, all at once there rose a Thought in me, and I asked myself — "What *art* thou afraid of? Wherefore, like a coward, dost thou forever pipe and whimper, and go cowering and trembling? Despicable biped! what is the sum-total of the worst that lies before thee? Death? Well, Death, — and

say the pangs of Tophet too, and all that the Devil and man may, will, or can do against thee! Hast thou not a heart; canst thou not suffer whatso it be; and, as a child of Freedom, though outcast, trample Tophet itself under thy feet, while it consumes thee? Let it come, then: I will meet it and defy it! And as I so thought, there rushed like a stream of fire over my whole soul; and I shook base Fear away from me forever. I was strong, of unknown strength; a spirit, almost a god. Ever from that time, the temper of my misery was changed: not fear or whining Sorrow was it, but Indignation and grim fire-eyed Defiance." (p. 75.)

Here observe that the question is settled, not by repentance, not by humble submission to God; not by yielding self-will and casting himself upon Christ and looking to Him for mercy and peace; not by any grace or help from abroad — above, beneath, or around; — but by a stupendous act of self-assertion, by a mighty uprising of the whole will-power, spurning the influences that annoyed him, and bidding them defiance. In this way he sought quiet, and thought he found it — or the beginning of it; but as far as there was quiet at all, it was the quiet of cold spiritual death, not of spiritual life. No doubt a measure and a kind of composure may be ultimately obtained, and often is, by any such concentrated and gigantic act of self-will and defiance on the part of the "child of freedom"; but such an act, when the soul has been powerfully and thoroughly enlightened and convicted, *may* not be far from that sin against the Holy Ghost which never has forgiveness. And when the soul thus bids away its heavenly tormentors, and leaves self-will on the throne, no doubt also the Heavenly Voice is: "He is joined to his idols; let him alone." In any event, the act reminds one of the pride and self-will of Milton's Satan, not of the humility and self-surrender of the Apostle Paul.

But observe, this is rest only relatively. It is rest compared with the infinite tumult and misery preceding; but it is not such rest as "the weary and heavy laden" find in Christ. Compared with this it is painful unrest still. Accordingly,

Carlyle represents Teufelsdröckh as restless and unsatisfied, to an extent, after the destiny-hour; as "not ceasing, though intermitting, to eat his own heart"; as "clutching around him outwardly for wholesomer food"; in like manner as diverting thought from himself by all kinds of outward studies, travels, and occupations; as drawn, it would seem, by some secret sympathy, to the contemplation of others' miseries and delusions; and as, after all, but partially keeping down "the Satanic School" in his own heart. The Christian interpreter will have little difficulty in understanding by this representation that Teufelsdröckh is still troubled by questions of conscience, and convictions of religious duty, which will not away at his bidding. Thus he says plainly: "If in that great moment, in the *Rue Saint Thomas de l'Enfer*, the old inward Satanic School" — by which he must mean, in our truer and more intelligible psychology, the corrosions of feeling arising from his doubts, the agony of the contest going on within between self-will and the Holy Spirit — "was not yet thrown out of doors, it received peremptory judicial notice to quit; — whereby, for the rest, its howl-chantings, ernusphus-cursings, and rebellious gnashings of teeth, might, in the meanwhile, become only the more tumultuous and difficult to keep secret." (p. 76.)

The process of wasting the crushed sensibilities and of stiffening up the will in indifference, however, goes on in the usual way; and at length, in the Chapter headed "The Everlasting Yea," he asserts that the triumph of self-will is complete; but the fact of the assertion and the form of it alike show that conscience is still ill at ease. He says: "The hot Harmattan-wind had raged itself out; its howl went silent within me. \* \* I seemed to surrender, to renounce utterly, and say: Fly, then, false shadows of Hope; I will chase you no more, I will believe you no more. And ye, too, haggard spectres of Fear, I care not for you; ye too are all shadows and a lie." (p. 82.)

And here we will turn aside, for a moment, from Carlyle in "Sartor Resartus," to Carlyle in the "Table-talk" with



Millburn, for a remarkable coincidence. Carlyle here remarks in relation to a sermon which he had attended some years before in a Wesleyan Chapel: "The sum and end of all the fluency and vehemence in the sermon, of all the fervor and unction of the prayer, was, 'Lord, save us from Hell!' And I went away musing, sick at heart, saying to myself, 'My good fellows, why all this pother and noise? If it be God's will, why not go and be damned in quiet, and say never a word about it? And I, for one, would think far better of you.' So it seemed to me that your Wesleyans made cowards, and I would have no more to do with their praying and their preaching." Here is more than one striking coincidence, — but we point only to this, — the continuance in Teufelsdröckh, for a time, and in Carlyle, even down to the visit to the Wesleyan Chapel, of a live conscience, making it necessary for both to resort to artificial and external helps, to resist the power of religious appeals.

The *positive* religion which Teufelsdröckh adopts in the place of the discarded Christianity may not be so easy to disentangle from the mass of speculations in "Sartor Resartus" and define. But it is clear that its central, inspiring *principle* is *self-assertion*, the exaltation of the native personality to the utmost, realizing its idea without regard to seduction or opposition. The immediate god we are to serve is this Idea of Self within, and serving that is serving the great God without. So much we infer not only from the "Conversion" of Teufelsdröckh, but also from the whole tone of the book. The *rites* of this religion are devotion to truth and justice with sincerity, earnestness, and abhorrence of all hypocrisy, cant, and shows. Carlyle, in summing up the character of his hero, says: "His attitude, we will hope and believe, is that of a man who had said to Cant, Begone; and to Dilettantism, Here thou canst not be; and to Truth, Be thou in place of all to me." (p. 128.) And about the *services* of this religion, all we can glean is a certain tender, pitiful, sentimental love for man, mingled with sarcasms and denunciations and leering jests and mockeries. We find

nowhere any exhibition of a working and self-sacrificing love for humanity. All work is for self — not, indeed, for happiness, or enjoyment, or the world, but to work out and gratify and exalt Self.

The *views* and religious *doctrines* of Teufelsdröckh agree with his personal religion, the central faith in the heart. He at length believes in a *God* — but his God seems a kind of cross between the Mohammedan's and the Pantheist's God — an immutable Will and Fate ; whether one with Nature, in the higher essence of Nature, or not, is not clear. *Man*, in his view, is a sorrowful and pitiable rather than a sinful being, — and his principal fault seems to consist in his seeming what he is not, and being fooled by shadows. But he bears a mysterious relationship to God. "We are," says he — "we know not what ; — light-sparkles floating in the æther of Deity !" (p. 27.) "Like a God-created, fire-breathing Spirit-host, we emerge from the Inane ; haste stormfully across the astonished Earth ; then plunge again into the Inane. \* \* \* But whence ? O heaven, whither ? Sense knows not ; Faith knows not ; only that it is through mystery to mystery, from God and to God." (p. 117.) This is the way he solves the question of the *origin of evil* : "Man's unhappiness" — and this he makes identical with the problem of evil — "comes of his Greatness ; it is because there is an Infinite in him, which with all his cunning he can not quite bury under the Finite." Sin and misery, therefore, are but the incidental chafing of the infinite in man against its prison-walls. (p. 84.) In the opinion of Teufelsdröckh, also, the *sorrows* which originate in consequence of this limitation are to be prized as a valuable discipline, and one must pass through them to arrive at any real freedom and self-conscious dignity. And much is said about the "*worships of sorrow*," which we suppose means a grateful, awed, devout sense of the good it is the means, or may be the means, of doing the soul. "Small is it that thou canst trample the Earth with its injuries under thy feet. \* \* \* Thou canst love the Earth while it injures thee, and even

because it injures thee." (p. 85.) Then, naturally enough, strength of will, to break through the limitations of earth and rise above the consequent sorrows, is the great practical *virtue*, and the great *joy* of life. "The painfulest feeling," he remarks, "is that of your own feebleness; ever, as the English Milton says, to be weak is the true misery." (p. 73.)

Various other beliefs are hinted at, not developed, but which have a logical place in the system, — some expressed openly, others referred to by innuendos. Such is the "perennial continuance of Inspiration" and Prophecy: "Knowest thou no Prophet; even in the vesture, environment, and dialect of this age? None to whom the Godlike has revealed itself, \* \* \* and by him been again prophetically revealed — in whose inspired melody \* \* \* Man's life again begins, were it but afar off, to be divine? Knowest thou none such? I know him, and name him — *Goethe*." (p. 111.) We are thankful for the illustration, that we may know precisely what is meant by the modern gift, and what value to attach to Carlyle's Prophet! Poor Goethe — we are afraid the Prophet in him has already passed away with the vesture, environment, and dialect of his age! Such, also, is the insignificant position occupied by the Bible — it is "but Leaves — say, in Picture-writing to assist the weaker faculty," of *another* "Bible," "of whose Plenary Inspiration doubt is not so much as possible." (p. 86.) We are not told what this other, and greater and truer bible is, but are at no loss to understand the light of nature, or the eye within. Such, again, are the insinuations that those who cherish revealed religion, profess and advocate the gospel, are "Baal-Priests," time-sorcerers, given to cant and hypocrisy, or fools.

Thus we have accomplished the object we had in view. We have attempted no literary criticism. We have not grappled with the whole spiritual history recorded in "*Sartor Resartus*." We have purposely omitted its purely psychological and philosophical elements, and confined ourselves to the religious; and we are by no means certain if these are not the fundamental

and inspiring elements of the work. And we have followed Teufelsdröckh through the religious struggle, and seen how he settled it, the religion he adopted, and his religious opinions. Here we leave him — sadly; and the rather, as Carlyle thus closes the door against the hope of some future change. “His character has now taken its ultimate bent, and no new revolution, of importance, is to be looked for. The imprisoned Chrysalis is now a winged Psyche; and such, wheresoever be its flight, it will continue.” (p. 90.)

Poorblind Teufelsdröckh — poor blind Carlyle! Must it be, then, that thou, who hast mocked so at the blindness of others, must now have the charge come back on thee? Thou hast thought that thou thyself wast a light, shining through the forms into the core of things, and hast offered thyself as a leader of the blind. But thou hast turned away from “the True Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,” and the light thou hast found and rejoicest in is but sparks of thine own kindling, nay, the phosphorescent gleam playing around a spiritually lifeless soul; and the book thou hast written — biography or autobiography — and designed as a light-house to point tossed, weary humanity to its secure haven, is, alas, but a lying beacon, luring to destruction.

## ARTICLE II.

## PORPHYRY.

The first of the old heathen philosophers who attacked Christianity was Celsus, of the second century. The next who signalized himself in this great controversy, was Porphyry, of whom we are now to speak. He was born at Tyre, about the year 233. His proper name was *Melek*, — with the Latin termination *Malchus*, — signifying king. In Greek, he was sometimes called βασιλεύς, *king*. Longinus, with whom he studied for a time, changed his name to *Porphyry*, which signifies *purple*. — a color usually worn by kings.

At the age of thirty, he came to Rome, and put himself under the care of the celebrated Neo-Platonic philosopher, Platinus. He was so much interested with the instructions of Platinus, that he continued with him six years. At the close of this period, he became desponding and melancholy, and was strongly tempted to put an end to his life. But his teacher told him that his gloomy thoughts proceeded, not from reason, but from some physical disorder, and urged him to leave the city. He did so, and retired into Sicily, where he remained several years.

During his residence in Sicily, Porphyry was married to Marcella, the widow of one of his particular friends, who had been left with five children. He professed a high regard for Marcella, on account of her philosophical turn of mind; but his chief motive in marrying, as he always insisted, was that he might aid her in training up her children. This shows him to have been of an amiable and generous disposition; nor was he ever charged, by friends or enemies, with any particular faults of life. On leaving Sicily, he returned to Rome, and was much esteemed there for his learning and eloquence. He died in the latter part of the reign of Diocletian, at the age of seventy.

Porphyry professes to have had some acquaintance with Origen, and remarks upon his peculiar mode of interpreting

the Scriptures. He was not old enough to have been with Origen at Alexandria, but may have seen him, later in life, at Cesarea or at Tyre. A memoir of Porphyry was written by Eunapius, and may be found in his "Lives of the Philosophers."

Among the writings of Porphyry may be mentioned "the Life of Platinus," and "a History of the Philosophers," in four books. He wrote a book, which is still extant, on "Abstinence from Animals," or from animal food. A work has also been ascribed to him, which was acknowledged to be genuine by some of the fathers, but is now generally regarded as spurious, entitled "the Philosophy of Oracles." The writer of this book brings forward the heathen oracles as testifying to the excellence of Christ's character, and to his eminent place among the immortals; also to the fact that the Hebrews had discovered "the true way to God." The work seems to have been written by some one in the interest of Christianity, who ascribed it to Porphyry. That Porphyry never wrote it is evident, not only from its contents, but from the fact that it seems not to have been known until many years after Porphyry was dead.\*

The work of Porphyry, by which he is chiefly known at this day, is that against the Christians, in fifteen books. It is much to be regretted that more of this work is not left to us. Though characterized by less of coarseness and vulgarity than the attack of Celsus, it was much detested by the early Christians; and Constantine and his successors so effectually suppressed it, that nought remains but some scattered fragments which may be gathered from the writings of others. In a letter of Constantine, which is still extant, he describes Porphyry as "an enemy of true piety, who has received a fit reward of his impious writings against religion. He is made infamous to all future times, is covered with reproach, and his impious writings have been destroyed." †

\* See Lardner's *Credibility*, vol. vii. pp. 444-467.

† Some copies, however, escaped the search of Constantine, which were gathered up and destroyed by Theodosius the younger, about the year 449.

Porphyry was replied to, at great length, by Methodius, bishop of Tyre, by Eusebius, the historian, and by Apollinaris of Laodicea; but these replies, as well as the work against which they were directed, are irrecoverably lost.

It is evident from what of Porphyry remains to us that he had carefully studied the whole Bible, the Old Testament and the New; for he brings forward objections to every part of it. He admits the high antiquity of Moses, and of the books which he wrote, showing that he lived long before the fall of Troy.\*

Porphyry objects to Moses' account of the temptation of our first mother, recorded in Gen. iii. : 5. "For God doth know that, in the day ye eat thereof, ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil"! "But why," says Porphyry, "should God prohibit the knowledge of good and evil? He might forbid evil, but why should he forbid good"? Porphyry forgets that the language to which he takes exception is that of the serpent, and not of God.

I have said already that Porphyry claims to have had an acquaintance with Origen, and objects to his allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures. The following is an extract from Porphyry, which Eusebius has preserved to us: "Some," says he, "being determined not to see the depravity of the Jewish Scriptures, but to find out a solution of objections that may be brought against them, have adopted forced interpretations, inconsistent with themselves, and unsuitable to those writings. For having given out that the things delivered plainly by Moses are types and allegories, and pretending that those writings are inspired, and are to be looked upon as oracles, full of hidden mysteries, and having by this means captivated the judgments of men, they, with a critical pride and vanity, set forth their expositions. An example of this absurd method may be observed in a man whom I saw, when I was very young, who then was in great esteem, and is so still for the writings which he hath left behind him, — I mean Origen, whose authority is very great with the teachers of this

\* See Euseb. Ev. Prep., Book i., Chap. 9.



doctrine. He was very conversant with the writings of Plato, and Numerius, and Longinus, and Nicomachus, and other distinguished Pythagorians; and having learned from them the allegorical method of explaining the Greek mysteries, he applied it to the Jewish Scriptures.\*

We agree with Porphyry in censuring Origen's allegorical interpretations, and also in the belief that he adopted this method from the Greek philosophers, — a fact which should have abated somewhat the censure of Porphyry in regard to it. Allegorical interpretations undoubtedly originated with the heathen philosophers: for, being ashamed of their stupid and ridiculous mythologies, and being unable to make anything out of them, if taken literally, they began to allegorize, and so bring them into consistency with their philosophies. This did the philosophers of India, in very ancient times. This did Plato, and the Pythagorians, and other philosophers of Greece. From them, this method of interpretation passed over to certain Jewish philosophers, and for the same reason. When Philo and other learned Jews of Alexandria had begun to philosophize, after the manner of the heathen, and found it impossible to reconcile their speculations with their Scriptures, they too began to allegorize; and then they could harmonize Moses and Pythagoras without difficulty. For the same reason, Origen and his followers, who thought it important to dip into the Greek philosophy, found it necessary to interpret the Scriptures allegorically. For, with a literal, historical interpretation, their philosophy and their Bibles could never come together; whereas, by the help of allegory, their Bibles could be made to speak anything they wished. As I remarked before, had Porphyry more carefully considered the source of Origen's allegories, it should have abated, if not removed, the censure which he put upon him.

Porphyry objects to the genealogy of our Saviour, as given in Matthew. "And Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon; and after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel."

\* In Euseb. Hist. Ecc., Book vi., Chap. 19.

Chap. i. : 11, 12. "Jechonias," he says, "ends the second fourteen, and begins the third, and must be reckoned twice, in order to complete the third division." There is probably an error in the reading here. In some manuscripts, the verse above quoted reads as follows : "And Josias begat Jehoiakim and his brethren, and Jehoiakim begat Jechonias, about the time that they were carried away to Babylon." Jechonias was not the son, but the grandson of Josias. See Kings ii. : 24-26. It does not appear, too, that Jechonias had any brethren; whereas Jehoiakim had several, the sons of Josias. This objection shows with how much scrutiny Porphyry had searched our Scriptures in quest of difficulties.

Porphyry has a fling at Matthew, for so readily consenting to leave his business and become a follower of Christ. Matt. ix. : 9. "Either the historian," says he, "has told a lie, or else people were great fools, to follow Jesus at his call; as though they were ready to follow any one who beckoned them."

Porphyry objects to a quotation which Matthew takes from Psalm lxxviii. : 2, which Psalm is said to have been written by Asaph. In the copy which Porphyry had, the passage from Matthew reads thus : "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Esaias, saying : I will open my mouth in parables," etc. Matt. xiii. : 35. "Your evangelist," says Porphyry, "was so ignorant as not to know that the passage he had quoted was taken, not from Esaias, but from a Psalm of Asaph." The word Esaias, in Porphyry's copy of Matthew, was an interpolation. With a correct copy, his objection had disappeared.

Porphyry was equally unfortunate in another of his objections to Matthew's quotations. "This is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make His paths straight." Matt. iii. : 3. "This," says the objector, "is taken, not from Esaias, but from Malachi." Chap. iii. : 1. But if he had looked through the Book of Isaiah, he would

have found the passage there also, and the reference of Matthew had been fully justified. See Is. xl. : 3.

Porphyry further objects to a representation of Matthew, that Jesus walked upon the sea. Chap. xiv. : 25. "This is stated," says he, "the better to impose upon ignorant people ; for it was only a lake upon which Jesus walked." But was it not as much a miracle to walk on the sea or lake of Galilee, as on any other sea ?

Porphyry thinks that some of the demons whom our Saviour ejected, and who expressed a fear that he had come to torment or destroy them, were only playing a trick upon him. They had no real apprehensions of evil, but merely feigned them." See Matt. viii. : 29 ; Mark v. : 7 ; Luke iv. : 34.

In commenting on the first verse of John's gospel, Porphyry endeavors to show that Jesus is not the Logos or Word. "If," says he, "he be the Word, he must be either the outer Word, or the inner — either speech or thought. But he is neither this nor that. Therefore he is not the Word."

Porphyry censures our Saviour's treatment of his brethren, in refusing to go up with them to the feast of tabernacles, and afterwards going up privately. John vii. : 8. "This shows," says he, "great fickleness and inconstancy."

Porphyry blames the Apostle Peter for "imprecating death upon Ananias and Sapphira." But there was no imprecation in the case. Peter simply declared the judgment of God upon them for their hypocrisy. See Acts v. : 1-14.

Porphyry has much to say of the disagreement between Paul and Peter at Antioch, as being quite inconsistent with their inspiration, and even their integrity. Gal. ii. : 11-14. He says "they had a childish quarrel one with the other. Paul burned with envy at the virtues of Peter, and wrote in a boasting manner of things which Peter never did, or if he had done them, it was mere peevishness to blame that in another, of which he had been guilty himself."

Others, besides Porphyry, have been troubled at this instance of disagreement between the two apostles ; but, as it seems to me, without sufficient reason. There is no evidence

that Paul did anything wrong in reproving Peter, or that the reproof was administered in an improper spirit. And as to the dissimulation and cowardice of Peter, we are under no obligations, as Christians, to defend all that the Apostles did, in their private intercourse with each other. Except when promulgating the revelations of God, they had no promise of Divine inspiration; and I would as soon think of accusing Peter for denying his Master, as for his dissimulation at Antioch.

Porphyry urges more than once, that if salvation can be had only through Christ, he ought to have appeared in the world sooner. "How came it to pass that the gracious and merciful God should suffer all nations, from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to the coming of Christ, to perish through ignorance of his laws and commands? If he needed to come at all, why should he come in the end of the world, after an innumerable company of men had perished?" Porphyry had forgotten, or never knew, that according to the Christian doctrine, all the holy men and women who lived before the coming of Christ were saved by him; and that "in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." Acts x. : 35.

Porphyry has another difficulty with the Christian doctrine, which is thus stated: "Christians find fault with sacred rites — sacrifices, incense, and other things, in which the worship of the temples consists. And yet they allow that this kind of worship began in ancient times, and by the appointment of God." Yes; bloody sacrifices and offerings were, of old, appointed by God as typical of the one great sacrifice of Christ. But when Christ had come, and offered up himself a sacrifice for sin, "he took the hand-writing of ordinances, which was against us, out of the way, nailing it to his cross." Col. ii. : 14.

We commend the following objection of Porphyry to the consideration of our modern Universalists. We presume they have never thought of it: "Christ threatens everlasting punishment to those who do not believe in him. And yet he says:

‘With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.’ But all human measure is limited to time. How then can the punishment meted out by God to the wicked be eternal?” It is evident from this objection that Porphyry, and the Christians of that day, supposed that Christ had taught the doctrine of eternal punishment.

Porphyry insists that the proselyting work of the Apostles was entered upon for the sake of gain. “Ignorant and indigent men, because they had nothing, performed some signs, by magical arts. But this is no great matter. The magicians in Egypt, and many others, have wrought signs.” To this Jerome replies: “If the Apostles wrought miracles that they might enrich themselves, why did they die? Why were they crucified? Others, you say, have wrought signs by magical arts; but did they die in defense of them? Our victory is completed in the blood of the Apostles, our faith is ratified in their death.” It will be seen, from this objection, that Porphyry, like Celsus, admitted the miracles of Christ and his Apostles; but insisted that they were performed by magical arts.

Porphyry’s principal objection to the Christian Scriptures,—occupying the whole of his twelfth book,—was urged against the prophecy of Daniel. He insists that the Book of Daniel was not written by him whose name it bears, but by some one who lived in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; and that it does not foretell things to come, but relates what had already taken place. In short, it is history, and not prophecy, up to the time of Antiochus; and if there is anything in it relating to events which occurred afterwards, it is all falsehood.

This same objection has been repeatedly urged in modern times. In the year 1727, Anthony Collins, an English infidel, published a book entitled, “The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered,” in which he urged anew the objections of Porphyry, and all others that he could think of, against the antiquity and authority of the Book of Daniel. But the most formidable assault upon this book has come, almost in our own

time, from the Rationalists of Germany. They have not only rejected the book, but treated it with contempt and scorn, insisting that its authenticity would soon be as little regarded as the story of Jack the Giant Killer.

The objections of Porphyry to the Book of Daniel,—so far as we have the means of knowing them,—are not very formidable. He thinks it unreasonable that a great king, like Nebuchadnezzar, should bestow so much honor upon a captive, merely for interpreting his dream; blames Daniel for receiving the king's gifts; and ridicules the queen-mother for coming in to speak to Belshazzar, pretending to know more than he. He puts the strangest and most unreasonable interpretations upon some of the visions of Daniel, so that none of them might reach beyond the time of Antiochus. He insists, against the authenticity of Daniel, that it was written, originally, in Greek. But this is not true; and the only ground on which he could urge such a pretense is, that he included in the book the apocryphal stories of Susanna, and of Bel and the Dragon, which no Protestant, Christian, or Jew admits to belong there.

The objections of the Germans to the authenticity of Daniel are equally fallacious with those of Porphyry. One is, that in our present Hebrew Bibles, the Book of Daniel is not placed among the prophets, but in the third class of sacred books—the hagiography. But we have the most conclusive proof that the book has been misplaced by Jewish critics, and probably with design. Its original place was among the prophets, between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. There we find it in the Septuagint. There it was in the time of Josephus, and of all the fathers of the first three centuries, as appears by their catalogues, and their positive testimony. Its place was changed by the Maronites and Talmudites, about the time of Jerome, and probably on account of Daniel's definite predictions as to the coming of the Messiah. The Messiah must have come, according to Daniel; for his seventy weeks had long been fulfilled. To be rid of this testimony, the Rabbins thought that the easier way would be,—not to reject the Book

of Daniel from the canon, for this they never did,—but to take it out from among the prophets, and place it in the third class of their sacred writings. And there it has stood, in our common Hebrew Bibles, ever since. It will be seen from this statement how little reason there is for questioning the authenticity of Daniel, on account of its place in the Jewish hagiography.

The other objections to Daniel all resolve themselves into this: The book contains accounts of miracles, and also the most remarkable predictions. This we admit; and if this constitutes a valid objection to the book, then we renounce it; we give it up. If miracles and predictions are impossibilities, which never did take place, and never can, then the greater part of the Book of Daniel is a fiction, and must be abandoned. But this objection, it must be remembered, does not stop with Daniel. It sweeps away the books of Moses, the four evangelists, and most of the other books of the Bible.

The course of Rationalists and infidels in regard to the predictions of Scripture is very remarkable. Show them prophecies, of which we can not point to the precise fulfillment, and they say, "These are no prophecies at all. They have never been fulfilled, and never can be." But show them other predictions, like those of Daniel, which have been most obviously and remarkably accomplished,—so remarkably, that there is no possibility of denying the facts of the case, and then the pretense is set up that the alleged prophecy is a forgery, written after the events which it pretends to foretell. It is history, and not prophecy. This is the way in which Daniel has been treated by the whole tribe of infidels, from the days of Porphyry to the present time, and it shows conclusively the intent and object of these men. If they can not destroy the credit of the Bible in one way, they will try another. They will never be satisfied—do not intend to be—until this dreaded, hated book is discarded, and its authority trampled in the dust.

The evidence, external and internal, of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel is as conclusive as any moral evidence can be. The prophet Ezekiel, who was contemporary with Daniel, and



in captivity with him, testifies repeatedly to the existence of such a man as Daniel—a man in the highest repute throughout the East for wisdom and goodness. “Though those three men—Noah, Daniel, and Job—were in” the guilty land, “they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness.” Again, speaking of the Prince of Tyre, and rebuking him for his insolence and self-conceit, Ezekiel says: “Behold thou art wiser than Daniel, and there is no secret which they can hide from thee.” Ez. xiv.: 14, 20; xxviii.: 3.

This same Daniel testifies continually that he did see the visions attributed to him, and wrote the book which gives an account of them, and his testimony ought, in all fairness and consistency, to be taken, unless there is strong rebutting evidence against it. Then our Saviour directly endorses the authenticity of the book before us. “When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, *spoken of by Daniel the prophet*, stand in the holy place, then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains.” Matt. xxiv.: 15. In this passage, our Saviour bears testimony to two things: First, that Daniel was a prophet; and, secondly, that he wrote the book ascribed to him, in which is repeated mention of “the abomination of desolation.” Chap. xi.: 31; xii.: 11.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, Paul speaks of some, “who, by faith, stopped the mouths of lions, and quenched the violence of fire;” referring obviously to the deliverance of Daniel and his three friends, as recorded in the book before us.

Josephus tells us that, when Alexander had come to Jerusalem, and entered into the temple, “the Book of Daniel was showed to him, wherein it was written that one of the Greeks should destroy the empire of the Persians.\* We have here direct proof that the Book of Daniel was in existence, and was referred to as a book of prophecy, in the days of Alexander the Great, more than two hundred years before the time when it is now alleged that this book was written.

In the first book of the Maccabees (chap. ii.: 59, 60), old Matthias is represented as encouraging his sons to stand up

\*Antiq., Book xi., chap. 8.

valiantly for the law of their God, by the example of Daniel and his three friends, who were miraculously delivered from the lions and from fire. Here again we have proof that the Book of Daniel was in existence, and was regarded as a sacred book, in the very commencement of the Maccabean wars, some time before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Again, the fact that the Book of Daniel has a place in the *sacred canon of the Jews* is proof conclusive that it was not written in the Maccabean period, but far back in the time of the prophets. The Jews were exceedingly strict on this point. No book that was not written by a prophet, or under the direction of some inspired prophet or teacher, could ever have a place in their canon. This is the reason why none of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament were admitted. The succession of inspired prophets and teachers had ceased. But the Book of Daniel has made a part of the Jewish canon in all ages, from the time of the Septuagint translators and of Josephus to this day. It changed its place, as before related, in the Hebrew Bible, in the time of the Maronites, but was still retained, as it now is, in the canon of the Jews.

Then the *internal* evidence of the authenticity of Daniel is complete. The accurate knowledge which the writer displays of ancient history, manners, and customs, and of Babylonish and Persian peculiarities, shows that he must have lived at or near the time and place which the book declares. No later writer could have drawn, as he has done, the characters of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius, or described so truly their forms of government, their festivals, their customs, and manner of life. The character of Daniel, too, as exhibited in the book before us, is unique, and yet consistent,—a noble character,—such as no falsifier could assume or depict. In short, this book is, even now, the best storehouse of Babylonish antiquities and customs that is extant. Why then should it be rejected? Why exclude it from the sacred canon, and thus extinguish the light which it has been sending down through the ages for more than two

thousand years, and which it is destined to shed upon the pathway of time, even to the end of the world?

If I had regarded only the objections of Porphyry to the Book of Daniel, the discussion might have been dismissed in much fewer words. But I felt desirous, as the subject was up, to go into a brief consideration of modern objections. To the enemies of the Bible, the Book of Daniel has been a stumbling block for long ages. And it is so still. If the Scriptures are to be discredited and destroyed, this book, with its predictions and their fulfillment, must be taken out of the way. Hence the multitude of assailants which have pounced upon it, and the persistent virulence of the attack. But the assault will be in vain. The Book of Daniel will hold its authority and place. There is much light yet to beam from it. It has many predictions yet to be fulfilled, which will confirm its truth and its inspiration, to the confounding of its enemies, and the rejoicing of its friends.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE GERMS AND GERMINATION OF ENGLISH CONGREGATIONALISM.

So far as the New Testament teaches any form of church polity, it teaches Congregationalism. So far as the history of the earliest churches shows anything regarding their polity, it shows it to have been Congregational. It is only when church history begins to be a record of selfishness, and strife, and ambition, that it discloses changes from the simplicity of Congregationalism to the assumptions of other forms of polity. A hierarchy is the offspring of human pride, not of Christian humility. In the long centuries of ignorance and superstition, priestly assumption and ambition ruled despotically. When the light of Christian intelligence and universal education began to pervade the darkness, the original Christian

doctrine and Christian polity began again to assert themselves, and to claim their divine rights. Meantime all along down the dark and dismal ages, wherever and whenever a pure Gospel was preached, the seeds of the Congregationalism of Christ and His Apostles were sown, and although rooted out and destroyed by its enemies with relentless vigor, traces of it may be found by the careful student, here and there all along the records of the past. The two witnesses of the Apocalypse have borne their testimony from the beginning to the end. From Pentecost to Puritan the Church, that grew up out of the Scriptures only, was Congregational.

Our present purpose is with the beginnings, or as some might say the ante-beginnings of English, and so of American, Congregationalism, embracing a period of two hundred and fifty years prior to the days of Robinson and the Mayflower, the times of Wycliffe and the Lollards, of the Gospellers and Bible men, of the Sectaries and Separatists. If there be any one man, more than any other man, who may be called the father, the founder, of English, and so of American, Congregationalism, that man is John Wycliffe; and in this jubilee memorial year, two hundred and fifty years after the planting of a pilgrim polity upon this continent, it may not be amiss to go back two hundred and fifty years more, and find the original modern starting point, and planting man, five hundred years ago. John Wycliffe, Warden of Baliol College, and Professor of Divinity at the University of Oxford, born in 1324, and dying in 1387 at Lutterworth, was one of those radicals that went to the root of things, and one of those conservatives, that, the radical truth once found, clung to it, and proclaimed it, through weal and woe. He loved the truth and he sought its source. He went to the Bible as the source of light for light. He loved the Bible, and the God and Saviour of the Bible, and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, he studied the Word, and became bold in the utterance of the truths to him revealed. He was one of those remarkable men, whom God, in His wisdom and goodness, now and then raised up as beacon lights to lighten the world, in its days of utter

darkness. He loved the Church of Christ, and the souls of men. He loved the people, and the people heard him gladly. He strove to do what a priestly hierarchy had never tried to do. He translated the Bible into the vulgar tongue, and disseminated it as widely as lay in his power. He wrote and scattered far and wide tracts and truths for the people. He organized and instructed, and sent out, companies of preachers to teach the people, charging them not to neglect the "uplandish towns and villages." He sought and found that very seed corn of a Gospel polity, of which we have spoken, and he planted it broadly up and down through the English realm. The soil was good, the seed divine.

He taught that "The temple of God is the congregation of men living religiously. \* \* Christian men taught of God's law, call holy Church the *congregation* of just men for whom Jesus shed His blood. \* \* The faithful should themselves search out, or discover, the sense of the faith, by having Scripture in a language which they know and understand. \* \* Since, according to the faith which the Apostle teaches, all Christians must stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and be answerable to Him for all the goods He has entrusted them, it is necessary that the faithful should know what these goods are, and the uses of them; for an answer by a prelate or attorney will not then avail, but every one must answer in his own person. \* \* \* *One thing I confidently assert, that in the primitive church, or the time of Paul, two orders were held sufficient, those of priests (presbyters) and deacons. No less certain am I, that in the time of Paul presbyter and bishop were the same.* That profound theologian Jerome attests the same facts. For there were not then the distinctions of Pope and Cardinals, patriarchs and archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, officials and deacons, with other officers and religious bodies without number or rule. As to all the disputes which have arisen about these functionaries, I shall say nothing. It is enough for me that according to Scripture the presbyters and the deacons retain that office and standing which Christ appointed them, because I am convinced that Caesarian pride has introduced these orders and gradations. If they had been necessary to the Church, Christ and His Apostles would not have held their peace about them. But the office of the clergy the Catholic may best learn from Scripture. Nor must he on pain of incurring serious guilt allow admission to Caesarian innovations. \* \* \* Three kinds" (composing the church), "first simple laborers, second \* \* defenders of the ordinances; but last and highest are the priests of Christ, who rightly preach His Gospel. \* \* Go and preach, it is the sublimest work. The highest service to which man can attain on earth is to preach the Word of God. \* \* Some time was when the same was bishop and priest, \* \*"

and each priest of Christ was called indifferently priest and bishop." And in a "complaint which he made to King and Parliament," he asks "That all persons of what kin, private sect, or singular religion, made of sinful men, may freely without any letting or bodily pain leave that private rule or religion founded of sinful men, and stably hold the rule of Jesus Christ taken and given by Christ to His Apostles. \* \* Christ's rule is enough and able for all men to live on."

His preachers, called, with their followers, Lollards, went out and gathered Congregations all over the land, until it was said, "they got over to their sect the greater part of the kingdom," and "they all had one manner of speech, and wonderfully agreed in opinion." In 1389 Archbishop Courtney proceeded against a congregation in Liecester. In 1390 a congregation met in a cottage in a desert wood in Hereford, and another in a chapel in Newton. William Swinderby preached in 1391, and Walter Brute in 1393. In 1396 William Dynor promises not to teach the doctrine of the Lollards. In 1399 schools were ordered to be closed, and all copies of Wycliffe's writings to be destroyed. William Sawtree was burned in 1401. In 1407 William Thorpe was examined before Archbishop Arundel. Thorpe avowed he had learned thirty years before of John Wycliffe "*how the church of Christ hath been, and yet should be ruled and governed*," and said he, "I will submit me only to the rule and government of those whom, after my knowledge, I may perceive to be members of the holy church." Thorpe died in prison. In 1408 came the trial of Sir John Oldcastle, the good Lord Cobham, who was burned in 1413. His testimony was:

"He that followeth Peter most righteously in pure living is next unto him in succession. \* \* Moreover though priests and deacons for preaching God's Word, and for ministering the sacraments, with provision for the poor, be grounded in God's law, yet have these other sects no manner of ground thereof so far as I have read. \* \* \* And as for that virtuous man John Wycliffe, whose judgment ye so highly disdain, I shall say here for my part, that before I knew that despised doctrine of his, I never abstained from sin; but since I learned therein to fear my Lord God, it hath otherwise (I trust) been with me. So much grace could I never find in all your glorious instructions."

Sir John Oldecastle has been much belied in history ; but his is the next great footmark in the Reformation, after Wycliffe. He paid liberally for copying and circulating the writings of Wycliffe, and sent out many preachers to instruct the people in the land. He was a true knight of the true cross, and a martyr to the faith of Christ. Bishop Bale (Bishop of Ossory) nearly one hundred and fifty years after zealously vindicated his character, saying of him, "After he had thoroughly tasted the Christian doctrine of John Wycliffe and of his disciples, and perceived their living agreeably to the same, he abhorred all the superstitious ceremonies of the proud Romish Church. From thenceforth he brought all things to the touchstone of God's word. He tried all matters by the Scriptures, and so proved these spirits whether they were of God or nay." He was slain in 1413.

About this time Sir John Beverly, a preacher, and Mr. John Brown, and Sir Roger Acton, with thirty-six more, suffered for the same faith. In 1422 William Taylor, and in 1430 Richard Wick, priests, suffered as Wycliffites ; and in 1440 the Duchess of Gloucester, with others who had been for a long time followers of Wycliffe, was imprisoned. In 1473 John Goose, and in 1494 Joan Broughton, a lady of rank, 80 years of age, and "thirty Lollards of Kye" (one congregation), were slain. Thomas Man, Richard Cosin, and others were faithful evangelists and preachers, who went about to break the bread of life to scattered churches. About 1500, a society was formed at Newbury, which had continued together fifteen years ; and at Amersham another goodly company had continued in that way and teaching twenty-three years, and so remained until 1530 or nearly. Man turned seven hundred people to his doctrine, and was burned in 1519. In 1506 William Tylesworth of Amersham was burnt. In 1511 Agnes Greville suffered, who had been converted to the views of Wycliffe in the reign of Edward IV., say about 1460. In 1517 John Brewster of Castle-Hedingham, and James Brewster of Colchester, in Essex ; and in 1519 seven Gospellers, together suffered. John Stillman, who was charged with



having heard and read Wycliffe's books for twenty years, and who declared he had always believed them, was condemned. Alice Collins was charged with repeating Scripture at Conventicles (church meetings) in Burford; and Agnes Ashford, who taught poor men the Gospel, was forbid by six bishops to teach it even to her children. Father Hacker, who was a zealous evangelist from 1520 for half a dozen years, and Thomas Philips, a reader and teacher, gathered congregations in London and vicinity.

Wycliffe taught that, "What man teacheth any truth of God, take that meekly with great thanks." And a Romish writer says, "Both men and women commenced teachers of the Gospel in their mother tongue." Few could read, and as many as could committed to memory portions of God's word. The only Christian instruction the poor people had, would seem to be such as was furnished among the Congregational churches of the Lollards. Bishop Peacock about 1450 calls them Bible men, or *known men*, and says: "They willed all priests to be in one degree, and none of them above other of them; and they willed that under priests be deacons, and no more orders, states, or degrees in the clergy at all."

And a visitation by the vicar-general in 1527 revealed the existence of many small societies of devout persons, recognized by each other as Brothers in Christ, or *known men*. A general term was Gospellers, as applied to them, and this seemed to have been used quite universally.

We have now reached a point where another broad foot-mark appears in the track down the path of time. John Wycliffe and his Bible are to be succeeded by William Tyndale and his Testament and Pentateuch.

William Tyndale was born about 1477. He became a preacher and fled to Germany in 1524. He took with him Wycliffe's book, and Thorp's examination, both which he printed. In 1525 he printed the New Testament, and afterwards various works for the people.

He says: "So now thou seest that in the kingdom of Christ and in His church or congregation, and in His councils, the ruler is the Scripture,

approved through the miracles of the Holy Ghost, and men be servants only, and Christ is the head, and we all his brethren; and when we call men our heads, that we do, not because they be shorn or shaven, or because of their names, parson, vicar, bishop, pope, but only because of the word which they preach. \* \* Wherefore the Apostles following and obeying the rule, doctrine, and commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ their master, ordained in His kingdom and congregation two officers, one called after the Greek word Bishop, in English an overseer, which same was called priest (presbyter) after the Greek, Elder in English, because of his age, discretion, and sadness" (gravity). "Another officer they chose and called him deacon after the Greek, a minister in English, to minister the alms of the people to the poor and needy."

He translated *presbuteros*, elder, and speaking of Timothy he says, "I durst not call him *episcopas* properly, for those overseers which we now call *bishops* after the Greek word, were always biding in one place to govern the congregation there." *Ecclesia* he interpreted, *congregation*, and says, "now is *ecclesia* a Greek word, and was in use before the time of the Apostles, and taken for a congregation among the heathen, where was no congregation of God or of Christ. \* \* Wheresoever I may say a congregation, then I may say a church also."

Tyndale was joined by John Frith, student of Cambridge and professor at Oxford, and with great diligence continued to print Testaments, books, and tracts for distribution in England. In 1525 an association of *Christian Brothers*, so-called, was formed in London, by tradesmen, artisans, and clergymen, who contributed regularly of their means for the purchase and dissemination of Bibles and tracts among the people. It was a regularly organized Bible and Tract Society, with its colporteurs and preachers, after the Wycliffe pattern somewhat, with the advantage of printing. Thomas Garrett, a curate, disseminated these books at Oxford, and John Clark, professor at that university, became deeply interested. Frith suffered in 1533, Clark in 1528. Tyndale was betrayed and slain in 1536. Sir Richard Fox, Masters Maxwell and Stacey, Richard Bayfield, Thomas Bilney, and Miles Coverdale are names that appear at this time, and meetings were held

where these men read and preached. Miles Coverdale translated and printed the first complete *printed* English Bible, 1535.

John Lambert was a companion of Tyndale, and an eminent scholar. He contended for the authority of the Word, the equality of the clergy, and their right to preach anywhere, and he was condemned by Cromwell (as Frith had been by Cranmer), in 1538. Wolsey fell in 1529. Cranmer was made Archbishop in 1533, and Thomas Cromwell lord vicegerent in ecclesiastical matters in 1534. King Henry VIII. assumed the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England 1535, in which year he executed Cardinal Fisher, and Lord Chancellor More, for denying his supremacy. The king was now pope. The Church of England merely changed masters, but Cromwell for a time permitted the circulation of reformed writings, perhaps for political reasons, possibly from better motives.

*Francis Lambert of Avignon*, and theological professor at Marburg, had said in 1524, in a treatise written by him, "The church is the congregation of those who are united by the same spirit, the same faith, the same God, the same mediator, the same word, by which alone they are governed, and in which alone they have life. The Word of God is the true key. Whoever therefore truly possesses the Word of God, has the power of the keys, all other keys, all the decrees of Councils, and Popes, and all the rules of the monks are of no value. \* The church can only be taught and governed by the word of the Chief Shepherd. Let no one believe that by a bishop we understand anything more than a simple minister of the word of God. Let the faithful assemble, and choose their bishops and deacons. Each church should elect its own pastor. If a bishop causes scandal let him be deposed by the church."

This Lambert at this time dedicated a treatise to Anne Boleyn, in which he says:

"Every preacher of the truth is a true bishop. Every parish ought to have its proper bishop, chosen of the people, and confirmed of the commonalty of the church of every place. Deacons of the church are those that the faithful choose to gather and distribute to the poor. The church hath no other official members, besides those of bishops and deacons."

In 1535 the Clergy of Convocation protested "that it is

preached and taught that the church is the congregation of good men only. The church hath no official members besides bishops and deacons." Melancthon was invited to England, but did not come. A convocation was held, and in 1536, *Cromwell, with the two archbishops, eleven bishops, and twenty divines and canonists*, signed a declaration regarding "the functions and divine institution of Bishops and Priests," in which occurs the following very remarkable statement:

*"The truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops."*

The king being now Pope, of course persecuted the saints. "Our king," says Hooper, "has destroyed the Pope, but not popery." In 1540 he executed Cromwell for being a heretic and dispersing erroneous books among the king's subjects. Many people were persecuted for having and reading a "seditious epistle" of Melancthon, in which he says:

"Thus St. Jerome teacheth that the difference between the degree of a bishop, and another priest or pastor, was made by man's authority. For else they have like power and authority in the Scripture. The degree of a bishop and a pastor do not differ by the law of God. The church must needs retain authority to call, choose, and ordain ministers, and this authority is a gift properly given unto the Church, which no man's authority can take away from it, for in old time the common people did choose pastors and bishops."

Henry died in 1547. Three years after, under Edward VI., Hooper says, "The Church is bound to no sort of people, or any ordinary succession of bishops, cardinals, or such like, but unto the only Word of God. I call the visible church a visible congregation, unto the which I would all Christian men should associate themselves." And for such sentiments he was afterwards martyred under Bloody Mary in 1555. The Commonalty, in a petition for more frequent preachings, very significantly say, "the providence of God hath cast us into some other place, by occasion of our calling, where we have heard the word preached." Evidently referring to voluntary congregations down-come from Wycliffe. Strype says

that "Sectaries appeared now in Essex, and Kent," (John and James Brewster were Essex men, whence came Elder William Brewster in after days, and Agnes Greville was a Kentish woman) "sheltering themselves under the profession of the Gospel. These were the first that made separation from the Reformed Church of England, having gathered congregations of their own. Contributions were made for the maintenance of their congregations, and the members of that in Kent went over unto that in Essex to instruct and join with them."

By permission of the King, churches of foreign refugees were formed in England, "in which they could freely regulate all things wholly according to apostolical doctrine and practice, in which they appointed elders to assist the minister, and deacons to take charge of the poor." John A'Lasco, a Polish nobleman, converted under Zwingle, was their best preacher.

Bloody Mary became Queen, 1553. Notwithstanding all her persecutions, the "*Gospellers*" lived. There was a congregation at Stoke in Suffolk, and another at Bow-Churchyard. During all her reign, there was a congregation in Colchester (Essex) which was regularly ministered unto by Lawrence and others. Congregations also met at London and elsewhere. In 1554-5 a congregation of thirty, with their minister, Master Rose, were arrested and committed to prison in London. At Islington John Rough was pastor and Cuthbert Sympson deacon, in 1557, of what was called "the secret society and holy congregation of God's children." Rough was burnt in 1557, and Sympson in 1558. Rough was one of a series of pastors of a church of several hundred members which existed in London in Mary's reign. In April, 1558, a congregation of forty men and women were seized at Islington and condemned to death. Craume was burnt in 1556. In his questions and answers, he says, "Bishops and priests (presbyters) were not two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion."

Mary died in 1558, and Elizabeth became pope in her own right, and sought to repress all Congregationalism, but with-

out success; although some claimed that they had more liberty under Mary even, than under her. Congregations met at Plumbers Hall in London, and in 1567 a Congregational church was formed, with Richard Fitz as minister, and Thomas Rowland deacon. They called themselves "a poor congregation whom God had separated from the Church of England." Eleven men, sixteen women constituted the original number. Fitz and Rowland died in prison. In 1570 Cartwright, professor, and 1573 Deering, lecturer, at Cambridge, held that all clergy should be of the same degree, and church officers should be only bishops or ministers, and deacons. John Brown, Chaplain of the Duchess of Suffolk, and Robert Browne, who recanted in 1586, were Separatists. The latter wrote very clearly regarding the Congregational way, so that the separatists were, from him, called "Brownists." John Penry, Henry Barrow, and John Greenwood, martyrs all, appear soon after. In 1592 a church was organized and Francis Johnson chosen Pastor, and Nicholas Lee and Christopher Bowman, Deacons, and Daniel Studley and George Kniston, Elders, and John Greenwood, Teacher. This church was surprised at one of its meetings, and forty-six persons were sent to jail. Seventeen died of prison plague. Johnson was banished and died in exile. John Smyth, a pupil of Johnson, formed a Christian Society at Gainsboro in 1602. Through the influence of Smyth, Richard Clifton identified himself with the Separatists, and Bishop Hale says the same was true of John Robinson, who was a member of the Gainsboro church, in 1604. In 1606 a second church was formed at Scrooby at the house of William Brewster. This church had for its first pastor Richard Clifton, and for its second John Robinson. This was that church which removed to Leyden in Holland, and thence to Plymouth in New England, and of that church William Brewster was elder and Samuel Fuller deacon.

We have not named a tithe of those precious saints, of whom the world was not worthy, who received into good and honest hearts, and retained in meekness and long suffering,

and transmitted with courageous perseverance, the pure gospel truth, and gospel polity, from generation to generation ; but enough for our purpose ; — the chain is complete. We have now come down by regular steps from Wycliffe to Robinson, — from Baliol College to the Mayflower, — from the Pilgrim at Lutterworth to the Pilgrims at Plymouth. Wycliffe learned congregationalism from the Scriptures, and the Scriptures translated into the English tongue, and disseminated by Evangelists, Colporteurs, Missionaries, Teachers, taught Congregationalism as a church polity to his followers and successors. When the Seer of Patmos fell at the feet of One like unto the Son of Man, He laid His hand upon him and said, “ Fear not, I am the First and the Last : ” but when he fell at the feet of the angel, he said, “ Do it not, I am thy fellow *servant*, and of thy brethren. Worship God.”

## APPENDIX.

It may be instructive to notice what some of the early English bishops (and persecuting bishops at that) have to say of church polity during these times.

Peacock, Bishop of Chichester, 1450, said “ Christ willed the hierarchical government to be reared up by the prudence of men after His passing from this world, and that He alloweth and approveth the said rearing and setting up by men’s prudence.” And his reason is, simply, because it is not forbidden by Scripture, or by reason, or by law, and therefore is not unlawful.

Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1583, said, “ I do not deny but in the Apostles’ time, and afterward to Cyprian’s time, the people’s consent was in many places required in the appointing of ministers ; but I say that in the whole Scripture there is no commandment that it should be so, nor any example that maketh therein any necessary rule ; but that it may be altered, as time and occasion serveth. For in such matters not commanded or prohibited in Scripture touching ceremonies, discipline and government, the Church hath authority



from time to time to appoint that which is most convenient for the present state."

And Lord Chief Justice Hobart, in *Colt et al. vs. The Bishop of Coventry*, Hobart's Reports, more than two hundred and fifty years ago, says, "For though it be given *jure divino* that Christian people be provided with Christian officers, and duties, as of teaching, administration of sacraments, and the like, and of pastors for that purpose; and therefore to debar them wholly of it were expressly against the law of God; yet the distinction of parishes, and the form of furnishing every parish church with its proper curate, rector, or pastor, by way of presentation, institution, etc., as is used diversely in divers churches, and the state or title which he hath, or is to have, in his church, or benefice, is not a positive law of God, in point of circumstance. For we know well that the primitive Church, in its greatest purity, were but voluntary congregations of believers, submitting themselves to the Apostles and other pastors, to whom they did minister of their temporals as God did move them."

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### DOCTRINAL PREACHING.

The question which agitates the preacher Monday morning is, What shall I preach next Sabbath? Without undertaking to answer this question in detail, we say, in general he must preach some doctrine, either directly, or by implication, or in application. If he preaches, some doctrine must be at the foundation. All true preaching is, in the nature of the case, more or less doctrinal. The preacher must also preach doctrines which will commend themselves to the common sense of men — doctrines which *unprejudiced* minds will accept as true. No other kind of preaching will be at all effectual, or command the permanent respect and attention of thinking minds.

I. But we are met at the outset with a grave objection to doctrinal preaching. It is said that this is a practical age, and men want something practical; they do not want doctrines. This objection assumes a distinction which does not really exist between the doctrines of the gospel and its practice. It is related of Prof. Stuart, that during his short pastorate, he dwelt much upon certain doctrines of grace which his predecessor had neglected. People were aroused. Some said one thing; some another. The result was that his preaching was with power; his church was filled with eager listeners; experimental piety was greatly and permanently increased. Some of his hearers, restive under such unusual tone of preaching, begged him to give them less doctrine, and more practical sermons. He complied with their request, and commenced giving clear and searching expositions of the divine law. The sting of this last was worse than of the first; and these same auditors waited upon him soon after, and besought him to return to the doctrines. They had enough of practice. The simple fact is that those who magnify practice against doctrine, want one as little as the other. Aversion to truth originates dislike of doctrinal preaching. For the truth in its antagonism to a corrupt nature, if it is doctrinal, requires corresponding practice; if it is practical, requires corresponding doctrine. The two can not be separated. They are wedded together as one. Those who ask for practical preaching, need not suppose that they will hear no doctrine, if they hear truth.

If we do not preach doctrine, what shall we preach? We have nothing to preach except that religious system which is revealed in the Scriptures. But what is this system except the doctrines which comprise it? Take away its doctrines, and what would be left? The gospel of Christ is declared to be the power of God unto salvation to those who believe. But in what consists its power? In its nerve and sinew. But these are its doctrines. What a body without bones would be, a system of religious truth would be without doctrines. No system of religious truth was ever promulgated without promulgating doctrines peculiar to it. No such system ever

existed apart from the doctrines which gave it character and name. The thing is as impossible as it is absurd. How could one preach Romanism without preaching the doctrines of Romanism? What is Romanism, if not those doctrines which bear this name? How could one preach Christianity without preaching the Christian doctrines? As well attempt to breathe without air. Eliminate from the Bible everything that teaches, or alludes to, or is based upon doctrine, and you eliminate the whole. Take from a sermon everything doctrinal in matter or allusion, and you take away the sermon and leave only a weak, nerveless essay.

Let us take an illustration and see if it is an easy matter to avoid doctrines in presenting even those themes which would seem to be least related to doctrine. Take this theme—the blessedness of the redeemed. No one would probably object to a sermon on this topic. Yet it is itself a statement of a capital doctrine. Present it, and you present a doctrine. Farther, a discussion of it must assume certain other doctrines, without which this theme could not be. A presentation of it must be a substantial presentation of these doctrines. Let us analyze it and see. The blessedness of the redeemed supposes an Atonement, without which they could be neither redeemed nor blessed. At the very threshold of this theme we have *the* doctrine of the New Testament, and find a root of contention. This brings us within the circle of doctrines which center in the Cross—repentance, regeneration involving human and divine agency, the Holy Spirit to supplement the work of Christ by bringing men to repentance and renewing them unto salvation, sin with its black history, free agency, responsibility, and above all the merciful love of God so abundantly manifested in Christ. All these suggest a law which men have violated, a law-giver who makes his laws and executes them with rigorous justice, divine providence and sovereignty, which involve a governor. Here are necessarily suggested the attributes of this governor. The manner of his existence is also involved, which brings us to the doctrine of the Trinity. The doctrine of special revelation is also involved, which

includes all the doctrines relating to the Scriptures. One may discourse of flowers, and the colors of the rainbow, and beautiful sunsets, and the roar of the sea, and many other things, perhaps, in such a way as not to involve a single doctrinal truth; that would not be preaching. But one can not discuss, if he *preaches*, any subject relating to Christian experience, or to the spiritual condition of men, without putting in motion a train of suggestion which, if followed, will include the whole system of Evangelical doctrines. This is the glory of the system, and the glory of preaching it. Its doctrines are too inseparably implied in and connected with their practice to be separated from it in proper treatment. Not a link can be left out. One must take his stand upon the doctrines and preach them directly or by implication, or not preach at all. An exhortation can not be made to sinners which will not involve doctrines. Men can not be led to the Cross except by the way of the doctrines; remove the doctrines, and you remove the approaches to the Cross; nay more, you take down the Cross itself. Without them, Christian character could not be developed,—would be well-nigh impossible. A prime duty of the preacher is to incite and promote the growth of such character. But it is inspired by Christian truth. Then he must preach Christian doctrine, for all Christian practice is rooted in it—can not exist apart from it, in a healthy state, if at all. An attempt to edify the church without doctrinal instruction would be like attempting to build a house without a frame. Remove the doctrines from the pulpit permanently, and it is reduced to a mere platform.

We do not contend for theological and philological abstractions in the pulpit. It can not profitably be made a polemic arena. The sanctuary is not a theological seminary, its congregation theological students, and the preacher a professor. Yet if men are to be saved by the foolishness of preaching, preachers must take care that none are lost because they preach folly. But they will preach folly if they ignore, in their pulpits, the great doctrinal foundations of the scheme of salvation. That scheme can not be preached—is not possible—apart from the doctrines which constitute it.

II. But men say, preach the love of Christ as much as you like, but do not touch the hard doctrines. A clergyman was once invited to preach for a church as a candidate, but was warned not to preach the doctrines, especially the doctrines called hard. He did preach the doctrine of faith, and left that people to find, if they could, some one who would be willing to stultify himself and his pulpit by tying his sermons to the unceasing cry of nothing but love. Men seem to have suddenly acquired an unusual passion for hearing about the love of Christ; as if the love of Christ could signify anything if there were not threatening in the back-ground to give vividness and meaning to it. The theory of some men seems to be that God is too weak to have any indignation against sin — at least any indignation worth mentioning. They do not seem to remember or know that the threatenings of God add immensely to the effectiveness of His love. We can not preach the attributes of God effectually unless we mingle the threats with the promises. It is not safe to let men forget that God is angry with the wicked every day. It is not safe to conceal from men the fact that God has declared that He will miserably destroy incorrigible sinners. Hence effectual preaching will, to some extent, draw force for its appeals from the terrors of the law. Knowing the *terrors* of the law we persuade men.

It is true that men do not like to hear the severe doctrines discussed. They would rather hear about love than justice. Churches are formed for the express purpose of preaching the former and excluding the latter. Men who make so much of mercy seem to forget that God can not be merciful till He has been just. If the doctrine of justice is eliminated, or kept hidden from view, what power of appeal is left to the preacher? If you can not tell a man that he is in danger, how will you persuade him to change his course of life? It is very true that some men are moved by the consideration of God's love; but others are moved only when they are afraid. Future punishment must be made to seem to them a reality as fearful as it is. If we are to use all means to save men, this must be

included. Men often get the most impressive sense of one's love for them when trembling under a sense of incurred displeasure. Great discretion is necessary in treating the severe doctrines so as to give them their full force ; but they must be treated. Every appeal that has force derives it more or less directly from the threats of the Bible. When does God's love for men have more influence, or appear more distinctly, than when presented with the implied fact that this love, if slighted, must, in the nature of the case, ensure endless misery. This is not a wholesome truth, yet it is one of the prominent threads in that net-work of doctrine which underlies every truth of the Bible.

If, then, the doctrine of punishment is not evangelically held, all appeals must be lame. This is proved by the spiritual history of those denominations which hold that God is too good to punish any man eternally, no matter how incorrigible a sinner he is. They make God's love a vapid, foolish thing, without any sense whatever of what is just. If a preacher does not believe and preach the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, what shall he urge men to shun ? Why urge men to accept salvation since they are sure of it ultimately whether they accept it or not ; whether they repent or not ! Remove the doctrine in question, and you remove the necessity of preaching. It becomes morally and rhetorically a farce. Then, instead of being saved by the foolishness of preaching, men will be made fools by the folly of preachers.

If this doctrine is not true, or, if true, is not to be mentioned in the pulpit, pull down the churches and hush the voice of the preacher. Some may say : Preach the popular virtues, make society better, restrain crime, etc. But what will be gained if the people are virtuous, society is made better, crime is restrained, since the ultimate result, which is most important, will not be materially affected ? Preaching which entirely ignores the doctrine of punishment would not hinder crime from overrunning the universe, disaffecting the hosts of heaven, casting God from His throne. We must hold and preach squarely the doctrine of punishment ; for we must declare the

whole counsel of God, of which this is part, whether men wince under it or not.

III. Then God, in *all* His attributes, should be the burden of our preaching; its center, its circumference, its all. Any preaching which departs from this standard is vicious. Perhaps man-exalting divines are becoming, in some instances, *facile princeps* among American preachers. A tendency sometimes seems to be creeping into some pulpits to glorify man at God's expense. Such preaching may attract crowds; so does a carcass, swarms of flies. But one is not more deadly poisonous than the other. It is a sad fact that the overflowing houses of some preachers are to be accounted for partly by this glorification of man. Said a lady to us, in speaking of the multitudes who flock to a certain church, of which she is a member: There are always people enough who will go to hear orthodoxy berated.

Perhaps a cause for this tendency is, that God is a truism of our belief; and so a constant utterance of it is abandoned, and the theme does not have its due prominence in the discussions of the pulpit, and is not brightened into its due lustre, and swelled into its due proportions. But the tendency of such neglect is none the less harmful. This tendency to drop God out of view—God in His fully rounded character—ought to be resisted. Coleridge says, we can seldom be more usefully employed than in "rescuing admitted truths from the neglect caused by their universal admission. Extremes meet. Truths, of all others the most awful and interesting, are too often considered as *so* true, that they lose all the power of truth, and lie bed-ridden in the dormitory of the soul, side by side with the most despised and exploded errors." Perhaps this is one reason why doctrinal preaching has fallen into such comparative desuetude, if not disrepute. The doctrines of the Scriptures may have come to be considered so true, that they are left to lie untouched, as if exploded errors. While it is true beyond a doubt, that improper and unnatural presentations of the doctrines of God and His complete character, repel men and give rise to an erroneous belief, it is equally



true that entire omission of these doctrines from sermons, makes Christianity simply contemptible. It is difficult to say which evil is greater. Neither need be the result. God, as He is revealed to us in the Bible, as it is evangelically interpreted, furnishes material, and the *only* material, upon which preachers can rely, for awakening in their hearers a permanent interest in their ministrations. Fortunately the day is past, when the minister was the arbiter of all affairs, both secular and spiritual, in his parish. Now he has peers in the pews in respect to secular matters. But if he be a man of God, thoroughly furnished for his work, his peers, in spiritual matters, do not sit in the pews before him. Therefore, Dr. Alexander says rightly of the preacher: "While there is any religion in the world, he will hardly fail to interest his flock, who feeds them with knowledge and understanding." He might have said, with truth, interest and *instruct*. A *healthful* interest can not be awakened by eliminating God from the place of prominence in the themes of the pulpit. Such elimination is most thoroughly accomplished, when God is represented as a goodish being, who is too weak to have any sense of justice — to easy to be indignant at sin.

Dr. Emmons always preached to an audience of eager listeners. Yet his sermons were, in a remarkable degree, clear and icy metaphysical reasonings, far less attractive and interesting than the plain truths of the Scriptures; and they were read off in the most passionless manner. He was accustomed to say, in his curt way: "I have generally found that people will attend, if you give them anything to attend to." Perhaps the manner of the old divines would be ill suited to meet the popular demands now. But people should be made to understand that their attention will be taxed on the Sabbath, and their souls plied with the truths of the Gospel — not that their fancies will be tickled with the threads of fine-spun theories. God, as the absorbing thought of our preaching, should be set forth in language that *will* find its way to the popular heart, to influence it imperatively in all the practical relations of life. The Psalmist said of the wicked: "God is

not in all his thoughts." May not this be true now, partly because God is not sufficiently in our sermons? God *will* be in the thoughts of our hearers, at least one day in seven, if we preach what we were commissioned to preach.

IV. Justice is not the only attribute of God. Mercy has a place by its side. This is possible, only through the death of Christ. If, then, we would hold up to view God's complete character, we must preach Him, as revealed to us in Christ. We must preach Christ. This is our vantage ground when we would vividly portray God's love. For the Atonement was that crowning act of mercy which rendered forgiveness possible on grounds consistent with justice. The Atonement emphasizes God's mercy and justice; both alike — neither at the expense of the other. The definition of mercy proves this. It is remission of penalty, for sufficient reason, which was justly deserved. The death of Christ furnishes this ground, and thus gives equal honor to both these apparently contradictory attributes.

The more exalted our conception of Christ's character, the higher will be our conception of the fact and spirit of the Atonement. The "Liberal Christian," under the editorial care of Dr. Bellows, takes a stand, in the following declaration of belief, which at once robs those of this faith of all power in preaching Christ. "The deity of Christ is incredible. The New Testament does not assert it, if it did it would disprove its own credibility." This is putting galling fetters upon the pulpit. It genders bondage. Much has been said of the bondage of the pulpit. This statement hints at the only servitude really to be feared; such bondage to human reason, that even the declarations of the Gospel would not be believed, should this reason pronounce them incredible. The piety developed under the shadows of such belief, committed to accept the guidance of reason against the guidance of truth and the Spirit, is sickly and dwarfed, like a plant hid from the sun. It is a fact that cheap views of Christ lead to equally cheap views of the Atonement, and the reverse. Cheap views of Christ and the Atonement, tend to beget cheap piety and

cheap preaching. The history of those denominations which deny the deity of our Lord, and of their uncertain theological dogmas, are proofs how dangerous it is to let down the standard of our belief in Christ. We do not say that there can not be piety, nor good preaching, among those who hold low views of Christ and His work. But if these exist, it must be in spite of these views and at great expense. Theodore Parker discoursed well of public virtues, and upon public questions, but his sermons seemed to lack leverage of spiritual power, to lift men into a spiritual life that is higher than mere morality. One reads Channing's sermons with interest; yet to an earnest soul, which has placed all its hopes upon Christ, a blot defaces them. The degree to which evangelical views of Christ are held, will determine a preacher's spiritual power with men. Take Christ out of a sermon, and you take God out of it. Express low views of Christ, and you will express low views of God. Facts prove the assertion. And with reason, for Christ is the only revelation of God to us as a Being of infinite mercy. Through Him alone we know that God is willing to save any. Cheapen your views of Christ, and you cheapen your views of mercy. Salvation loses its charm to draw men with an almost irresistible power.

It is not safe for men to believe that they can save themselves, as inevitably results from low views of Christ. Exigencies occur in the spiritual history of most men, when they will not and can not believe it. They spurn the thought. They demand a savior—a sacrifice; and their wants can not be met, by any preaching which does not hold up Christ as the object of their faith—Christ, not as a mere man, but as deity manifest in the flesh. They do not stop to ask whether this is incredible or not. They will be satisfied with nothing short of a vicarious sacrifice. Their hearts clamor for it. The idea of the *example* of a mere human being, or of any being at all, does not satisfy. The law demands a sacrifice, and this their hearts demand. Tell souls that are not so anxious about the credibility of the doctrine, as they are to find salvation, that Christ was a mere man, and they will turn away from

you to seek some one who will tell them that Christ was God-man. Tell them that His teachings and example are the only Atonement, and they will turn away from you to hear that Christ *died* to save sinners; from less cultured lips perhaps, but to them far truer ones. The story of the cross has a charm for such souls. It does them good to go up Calvary to weep; and they want a guide who will lead them where they can look upon a *crucified* Saviour as their sacrifice, and drop their tears at His cross. It matters much what we think of Christ, if we would preach to men with persuasive power. We can not tell what they preach, but they do not preach Christ, who hold Him up as a being shorn of His deity. When men are overwhelmed with an impressive sense of the enormity of their guilt, their souls long to be told of some supreme power which can assure their forgiveness; and so they love to hear and to sing of the "dying God." In these moods they do not stop to analyze. What they want is just such a sacrifice as Christ is.

Low views of Christ and His work lead to low views of God's love. He can not urge sinners, with full force, to take advantage of the mercy of God, who holds that the Atonement consists in anything less than Christ's death. As we have said, God must be just before He can be merciful. If the Atonement of Christ consisted merely in His being a perfect example for us, what room is left for any proper motives of justice? Such a low view of the Atonement grows out of a low view of Christ. Rationalism is far more consistent when it denies the doctrine.

To believe that a broken law, which has threatened death as a penalty for guilt, can be appeased by the teachings and example of a mere man, is to believe that such a law has no character. The real substance of this belief is that Christ merely showed us how to save ourselves by our own acts. What ground is here for preaching mercy; what ground for preaching free salvation? Such a doctrine cheats the law of its demand that there be suffering. Yet severest suffering has been threatened. We always regard death as the climax of

suffering. What meaning the Atonement has if we regard it as the death of a being, who was mysteriously God and man! That preacher must have most power over men who presents such views. When he speaks of mercy, he speaks of a reality, which has substance. Grace is the remission of a penalty which justice demands. Mercy prompts its exercise. Cheap views of justice, generated by cheap views of Christ, damage our views of mercy and grace. If then we would have exalted views of the mercy of God, we must have exalted views of Christ and His work. Which theory gives most meaning to the declaration that God so loved the world that He gave His son, so that those who believe may be saved? Which theory presents the motives of the Cross in their strongest light? If we rob Christ of His deity, His life and death mean nothing peculiar. As well preach Socrates as Christ. Paul might as well have said, We preach Socrates poisoned, as Christ crucified. The crowning act of His mission was a splendid farce, if He was only the man some make Him.

They who present such low views of Christ and His work, must present equally low views of sin. If we teach men that teaching and example can open the way for forgiveness; that God's law, which has threatened sin so severely, does not require sacrifice, how can we make them believe that sin is exceedingly sinful? The legitimate result of such doctrine is, that sin is not guilt, but misfortune, or disease, or misdirection. It takes us back to the old platonic idea that sin is referable to Hoyle, and so necessarily pertains to the finite. If you tell men that all Christ did was, what any man can do, and that every man can correct his own sinfulness, you can not make them feel culpable. They will justly infer that all they have to do is to struggle against imperfection, for which they are not responsible.

The weakness of preaching which presents such doctrines can be seen and felt. It has no grasp upon men's consciences. It may draw crowds to hear the words of a man, as they fall from cultured lips; but not one to the Cross, not one to repentance and salvation. To the Christian heart, such preach-

ing is merely as sounding brass. It does not feed a hungry soul, for it offers no bread of life. It takes away the crowning excellence of God's mercy. That thrilling passage, "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life," has little meaning, if "His only begotten son" were but a man. If this doctrine is true, it is a waste of breath to repeat this passage to men. It is a waste of breath to preach at all. An educated gentleman, of this school of belief, showed what a low estimate of preaching, such a faith begets, when he said, "Why do not clergymen take up some literary work and review it in their sermons, now and then?" Why not indeed, if the exclusively humanitarian view of Christ is correct. It is useless to preach to men about repentance and faith on any such basis, because our language would be as if Greek. One might as well review Dickens, as to speak from any passage of Scripture. The fact is, preaching in the proper sense of that term, is an impossibility, to that school of doctrine which places Christ down among the noted men of the race. Theodore Parker has published volumes of sermons. Yet his preaching was not such as Paul speaks of, when he said: "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks,—Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Such sermons, if they may be called so, do not demonstrate, what Paul's sermons did so fully, that the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. The style of piety, which they legitimately foster, amply proves that any preaching lacks spiritual life and power which does not assume Christ's deity. Then if a preacher would be effective, and preach the whole doctrine of God, he must hold the doctrine of Christ's divinity evangelically and preach it.

V. The doctrine of man is intimately related to the doctrine of God. Free Agency and the influences of the Spirit, sin, and divine sovereignty, can not be easily separated in the practical working of the scheme of redemption. It is of the

utmost importance for the preacher that he hold and present the anthropological doctrines so as to commend them to the popular mind. We must preach to men, about men, what men will believe; and so believe as to convince them of obligation. We must preach on Sunday what can and should be practiced on Monday. It is not well to present such doctrines, so that men will go away uttering the criticism, which one man did, "Either that man is a fool, or he thinks we are." The common mind demands consistency, in presentations of doctrines relating to men. If consistency is wanting, a sermon wastes its force, or has none. The fact is, earnest preachers, whatever their representations, when they enter the pulpit to point dying men to the cross of Christ, abandon theories which are liable to relieve men from a sense of obligation. When one sits down to argue, and coolly defend a theory, he may be troubled about questions of ability; but not when, with his soul on fire, he stands before men to repeat the message of Christ, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." The common mind, with which we have to deal, will not be persuaded by contradictions. It is useless to tell sinners that they can not repent, and end with an earnest appeal to do what you have just told them they can not do. It does not help the matter to say that if the sinner's inability is moral, it is real. If he can he can; if he can't he can't, and that is the end of it. If he can not because he will not, his inability measures his guilt. If he can not because he can not, he is not an agent and not responsible. It is true, as Dr. Alexander intimates, that the sinner must "go out of himself at once to a strength which is made perfect in his weakness;" but what if you tell him that he can not thus "go out of himself," but that he absolutely must wait to be dragged out by some external force. Can you fix guilt upon him for not having sought this strength? Will he believe you if you tell him so? Such theories are traditional. They may seem plausible when taught in the schools; but seek to apply them to real life, and you will find them worse than powerless — an incumbrance in the pulpit. The preacher must present them, not as a man,



but as a scholastic; not to suit individual cases, but man in the abstract. Such preaching will move no one. The pulpit is not the place to theorize, with our thoughts upon imaginary objects, when hungry souls are before us waiting, not for stones, but bread.

A working theology, that will adorn the pulpit, must have at least three elements. (1) It must be free from contradictions. Contradictions, whether real or apparent, put an end to any influence for good. The theory and its conclusions must not only be harmonious with each other, but also with the great end of preaching — conviction. (2) It must accord with the obvious tenor of the Scriptures as a whole, and as the unlettered mind reads. It is eminently true of a large portion of the Scriptures that the unlearned need not, and do not, err therein. The common mind is not so foolish in understanding the Bible, as some divines seem to assume. The ordinary mind becomes bewildered, only when dogmatists patch and fix the Scriptures to suit a theory. Most men, who are not theorists, find no difficulty in understanding that they can repent, and that this is therefore their duty. (3) It must harmonize with the necessary beliefs of the human mind. These beliefs, being founded in the constitution of moral beings, are right. To violate them is to violate truth. We must preach what men will believe.

Without inquiring as to the truth or error of certain theories which seem to lack these three elements, let us examine a few examples with a view to illustrate their effect upon the preacher's power. Take the theory of a limited Atonement. Since we always tell men that salvation is possible only through the death of Christ, how can we consistently urge them to accept of Christ as their Saviour, after we have proved to them that He did not die for all men, and that, therefore, it is possible He did not die for them? How can we urge them to enter in at the straight gate, after having told them that it would not be strange if this gate were shut against them? How can we vindicate the consistency of those exhortations of the Scriptures which seem to invite all men to be saved, if we preach

the doctrine that Christ died for a select few? We must distinguish between the scope of the Atonement, and its actual results in redemption. It can not be urged that the preacher does not know but every sinner in his congregation is among the number for whom Christ died. God, who does know, invites all men everywhere to repent: and if the preacher be truly a herald of the Cross, he speaks, not his own words, but the words of God. He has no right to utter any invitation which the Scriptures do not justify. He is stationed to declare the whole counsel of God, and to cry, "Ho, *every one* that thirsteth;" and when he utters this cry, he has no right to tell men that it does not mean every one.

Take again the theory of constitutional sin, as resulting from the theory that Adam's guilt is literally imputed to us. Men will tell you that they are not responsible for what Adam did. You can not refine their consciousness to such a degree that they will feel guilt for that act of our first parent. Any man, not blinded by theory, will tell you, and truly, that he is not responsible for sin that was created in him; for that is not his sin, and he has nothing to do with it. Tell a man that his sin consists in doing what he knows he ought not to do, and he will believe you. Tell a man that he is a drunkard because he was born with an appetite for strong drink, and he will turn from you in disgust. Tell him that he is a drunkard because he has deliberately gratified that appetite, and he will hang his head in shame because you have told him the truth. You can not make a man believe that he is a sinner, till he has sinned; and you can not make him believe that he has sinned, till he has done a sinful act. His sin must be his act, or he will not feel guilt. Remorse of conscience is not possible except for deeds of guilt. If you preach any theory contrary to this idea, your preaching will not reach him. His conscience may condemn him, but not because of your preaching; because his own sense of right and wrong tells him that he is guilty for guilty acts, and these alone. Men will not believe any such fanciful theory as that of involuntary sins. Tell a man that he is guilty because he chooses

evil, and your words will be so true that he will wince under them. Tell a man that he sins because he can not help sinning—that he may be guilty of involuntary disobedience to God, and he will laugh at you for contradicting yourself. That for which men feel guilt is, voluntary disobedience to the known law of God. The sin of act, not of nature, gives them remorse.

Closely associated with the theory of natural sin, is that of the sinner's absolute inability to obey God. We have alluded to this. Make a man believe that he absolutely can not obey God, and he will tell you, that you need not take the trouble to urge him to repent, for you have just taught him that he can not repent. Are you consistent, if in one breath you tell men that they absolutely can not repent, and in the next, that they ought? If you do, men will not come to hear you contradict yourself. You must be honest, when you exhort men. If one wishes to prepare the way to persuade men to repent, he must first insist upon the fact that they can. If we do not persuade men that they can flee to Christ, with what confidence can we point our fingers to the Cross? and say to men, "behold the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world?" What boldness can the preacher have to repeat Christ's words, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden," after he has taught men the harrowing truth that they can not come? If we can make men believe that they can not obey, what confidence can they have in the promises of the Bible, which all have conditions imposed, with which, we have told them, they absolutely can not comply? The fact is men do not believe that they can not comply with the commands of God. Preachers who have sincere regard for the salvation of souls, dare not teach this doctrine openly, even if they believe it. The only safe and effectual way to present truth is on the assumption, that God requires men to do nothing which they can not do—that, if God requires men to repent, they can repent. It is necessary that the preacher exercise care not to teach, nor seem to teach, any theory that at all narrows or seems to narrow the scope of the

universal invitations and promises of the Bible. It is better not to hold any such theory. It cripples the pulpit and fetters the Gospel. As Dr. Alexander says of another error, so we say of this: "He is paralyzed in making the Gospel offer, who can not, without conditions, bid *every* thirsty soul come and welcome. \* \* \* \* This is preaching a fettered Gospel, and it produces a fettered piety. It gendereth to bondage."

It is one of the values of that theology, known as the New England, that it holds such anthropological doctrines as are calculated to fix the responsibility upon men, and make them feel it — such doctrines, too, as do not at all impair our view of God's universal love for men, and His universal exhortations and promises. For this reason it is rhetorically superior to the opposite system. It is superior, too, because it accords better with the honest and natural convictions of unbiassed minds. Hence that preaching, which holds up such views, is and always has been effective. They are Scriptural views, and belong naturally to the pulpit.

It has not been our aim to defend the doctrines alluded to, any farther than to show that they are suitable to appeals from the pulpit; and to illustrate, how vitally associated with them all effective preaching is. One of the best defenses of a doctrine is, that it has value in furnishing an appeal to men. One of the strongest arguments against Rationalism is, that its doctrines give the preacher no power with the consciences of men. The pulpit has not to deal exclusively with intellects; its great aim is to reach the hearts of men. These are to be convinced and subjugated, as well as intellects. Hence any theology which overlooks men's hearts, is an incubus upon the pulpit — a stumbling-block in the way of success. Success in the pulpit, is to be measured by the spiritual power which it exerts. Measuring by this standard, we fearlessly assert, that the only successful men have been, are, and will be, those who hold the doctrines of the Bible evangelically, and present them in such a way that the common sense of men is not outraged.

By this measurement of success, they have been the most

successful preachers, who have always planted their feet upon the doctrines, when they have stood in the pulpit to speak to men. Without doubt, if success is to be measured merely by crowds and accessions of large numbers, they are the most successful preachers who treat the doctrines in a kind of patronizing way. But when the life-work of the preacher is summed up by one who weighs things accurately, that kind of success may be found wanting. But that solid growth, which springs from due presentation of the doctrines, and above all from their application to all the varied walks of life as the best regulators of human action, will bring the preacher that noblest and highest award of praise: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

We are persuaded, too, that preachers are liable to magnify some doctrines at the expense of others equally important. We know of a preacher who seems to have an unfortunate relish for the word hell, and for kindred doctrines, and no patience at all with the idea that God can love men while they are sinners. These doctrines are of vital importance, and must be preached. But they ought not to be pressed so far as to make men forget that God is not willing that any should perish. On the other hand, some preachers magnify love to such an extent as to hide the fact that God is just. These are extremes to be avoided. The one sours men's minds; the other makes Christianity simply contemptible. The golden mean is better. All the doctrines ought to be presented in such proportion and harmony, that our presentations of the character of God shall be as complete and beautiful as that character is. No preacher should allow himself to drop into doctrinal ruts. If he would be an effective preacher, he must be various in his presentations of Scriptural truths, now urging this, now that; now proving, now illustrating; always aiming to build up Christian character, in his hearers, out of those solid materials which the fundamental truths of God's word alone can furnish.

Another error to be avoided in doctrinal preaching, is seeking to prove what does not need proving. Whether we need

to prove a doctrine, depends upon the audience to which we preach. Most of our audiences admit, for example, the existence of God. Stop to prove this doctrine to them, and the tendency will be to make Atheists. If we stop to prove anything, we admit that it is not certainly established. It would seem to be a mistake for God to go into an argument to prove His omnipotence. It is better to assume what all admit. We may illustrate and apply such doctrines; the more the better. If we attempt to fortify an admitted fact by argument, we weaken it. When we were on our homeward voyage in the City of Paris, a Scotch Presbyterian was among the passengers. On the Sabbath, he preached a sermon, in which he sought to prove that God is not willing that any should perish. The Bible had said that so long before, he did not need to weary our patience with trying to prove what we all believed most heartily. How much more effect his sermon would have had, if he had assumed this truth, and illustrated it, by some of the many illustrations, suggested by the circumstances in which we were placed. One great power of the dissenting preachers in London lies in their accepting the truths of the Bible as established beyond a peradventure, and wasting no time in useless arguments to prove what every one believes, but proceeding at once, on the basis of these admitted truths, to ply men with exhortations to duty. We may need, for purposes of instruction, to state the arguments for admitted doctrines, but it should be done in such a way as to seem to be for instruction rather than for simple proof. If we assume that men do not believe what they do believe, we shall be likely to provoke unbelief.

But it is of vital importance that we present the doctrines in such a way as to show their value and application in all the routine of common life. The lawyer seeks to apply the law to specific cases. The preacher should seek to apply the doctrines of the Bible to the acts of men. Doubtless the age does not require dogmatic discussion, but it does require that the doctrines of the Cross be so unfolded, that they shall enter into and mold the life of men. This is largely the preacher's

business. He is appointed to declare the oracles of God. He must preach doctrine, if he would preach at all. If there is a tendency to ignore these solid foundations of faith, it is unfortunate for the strength and power of the pulpit. These are the only unfailing source from whence can be drawn the materials which belong to a sermon. Style, rhetoric, oratory, are without avail, if doctrinal truth be not declared. We must preach the Cross; but how can we, if we do not unfold, illustrate, and apply its doctrines? The preacher has no right to let anything crowd out of the pulpit the supremacy of the Gospel. That is the place to prove the practical value of the great truths of the Bible. If the preacher does not do it, who will? We are persuaded that the only way to rear a race of stalwart Christians, is to feed them the strong meat of the Word.

---

#### ARTICLE V.

#### THE SÂMA-VEDA.

Nearly a hundred years have passed since the British East India Company caused a translation to be made from Sanskrit, through the Persian, into English, of a portion of the native Indian laws, with the design of better governing their newly acquired subjects. This translation, executed by eleven Brahmins, was the first introduction of Sanskrit literature to the notice of Europeans. A few years later Sir William Jones, who had been before interested in oriental studies, went to Calcutta and began the study of the language. He was followed by other scholars, and from time to time translations of the epic and dramatic poetry of India appeared.

The discovery of such a mass of literature hitherto hidden from western eyes naturally excited the greatest enthusiasm. It was believed that a mine had been opened which would



yield richer ore than Greece or Rome. But further researches did not justify such great expectations, and the interest gradually declined. But as yet Europeans were acquainted with the later and more artificial literature. The oldest, and to us most instructive, had not been discovered, or at least not explored. Colebrook, who succeeded Sir William Jones, and who was one of the most acute and learned Sanskrit scholars of that or of any subsequent period, had indeed seen and examined the Vedas, but he gave it as his opinion that they contained nothing of great value. It is to Friedrich Rosen, a professor in the University of London, that we owe our first exact knowledge of a portion of these sacred books. In the year 1838 he prepared a translation of an eighth of the hymns of the Rig-Veda, but unfortunately he did not live to see it published. Possessing unusual fitness for his work, his early death was an irreparable loss to the cause of learning. But he did enough to reawaken an interest in Sanskrit studies. India was searched for manuscripts, and by the munificence of the King of Prussia, and by the active co-operation of the East India Company, a large number was collected in the Royal library at Berlin, and in the British Museum. Thus the language became accessible to all who were interested in the antiquities of the race without the necessity of making a pilgrimage to India. Scholars from all parts of Europe—from Germany, France, England, Russia, Denmark—and a goodly and increasing number from America, have not been slow to avail themselves of these advantages, and to contribute their much or their little to the difficult work of exhuming and reconstructing a civilization so remote in time and so isolated in place. As some of the results of these labors we have the beginnings of a Science of Language; we have more correct ideas of the origin and distribution of races; we have also convenient editions of all the Vedas, and editions of the most important works of the later literature. Indeed the zeal for printing has sometimes been unwise, and has produced works which might well have been left in the manuscripts.

Before beginning a description of the Veda whose name

heads this article, it may be well to premise a little concerning the Vedas in general, for the benefit of those who have not made language a special study. Both by the testimony of their own literature, and by the fragments of history which we can gather from other sources, we are enabled to conclude that the present dominant people of India are not the original possessors of the land, but that their primitive seat was in some region farther north; that they belong to the same stock as the great civilized nations of Europe and America; and that while the ancestors of the Persians, Greeks, Romans, Germans, etc., took up their march westward, the ancestors of the Hindus removed to the south, and, entering India at its northeast corner, the only place where Nature had left a gap in her impregnable mountain-wall, settled upon the banks of the Indus. From the very beginning they seem to have been devoted to religion. Though this tendency must be ascribed partly to native genius, yet the gigantic forms and powers of nature in that region were calculated to impress them. They were familiar with heaven-touching mountains, mighty rivers and vast plains; with a tropical sun, tropical storms, and tropical vegetation. The sun, the deep blue sky, the dawn, the storm, seemed to them manifestations of more than human power, and in time received their homage as gods. The emotions thus excited—thankfulness for blessings received, and longing for protection and prosperity—were expressed in poetic strains. Some of these hymns they doubtless brought with them into India, but most of those which have been preserved were doubtless composed while they were settled upon the banks of the Indus. After the hymns had been used for a long time in connection with sacrifices to the gods, they came to be regarded as somehow essential to the efficacy of the offering. They were agreeable to the ears of the gods, and enticed them down to partake of the proffered food or drink. Thus it became necessary to collect the hymns which were current in the various districts, and to determine what should be the authorized version. These hymns and, later, much literature connected with them, were called the Veda, or

“Knowledge,” since they were supposed to contain the germs and groundwork of all wisdom. But as many hymns were composed after the first collection had been made, and particularly as a varied arrangement and selection of them was needed to meet the requirements of the ceremonial, four collections were made, which have been known by successive generations of Hindus for many centuries as the four Vedas. The influence of these sacred books upon the religious and intellectual life of India has been incalculable. They have furnished texts for commentaries and commentaries upon commentaries without number. Though the childlike expressions of faith and devotion which they contain have been distorted and misapplied by a designing priesthood, and have furnished a starting-point for the wildest vagaries, yet no system of philosophy or ethics has survived in India, which has not been founded really or *nominally* upon the Vedas. Buddhism, which originated in an attempt to overthrow this tyranny of tradition, and which at one time seemed likely to subvert the established faith, was finally compelled to yield and to seek refuge in other lands.

Of the four Vedas, the Rig-Veda or “song” Veda is the most valuable, since it is the largest, most miscellaneous collection, and, for the most part, the one which contains the oldest hymns. It embraces the songs with which the ancestors of the Hindus “implored prosperity for themselves and their herds, greeted the rising dawn, celebrated the battle of the god of the thunderbolt with the powers of darkness, and praised the help of the celestials who rescued them in their contests.”

The second, as the order usually stands, but probably the first to be collected, is the Sâma-Veda, of which we are to speak presently. The third is the Yajur-Veda, which contains not only hymns, but also formulæ in prose, for the performance of the offering. The use of prose determines its later origin. The fourth is the Atharva-Veda, which is evidently the latest of all. Instead of the simple trust in the protection and good will of the gods which inspired the earlier

hymns of the Rik, we find a further development of thought. There are bad as well as good gods to ward off whom incantations are provided. Formulæ are given for enchantments, for averting disease. Healing plants are invoked, and petitions are offered for luck in play.

We return now to the Sâma-Veda. In the year 1842 a missionary, Rev. J. Stevenson, prepared an edition of this Veda with a translation, but in the latter he followed so closely the native commentators that the value of his work was greatly vitiated.

In 1848 a much better edition of the text, accompanied by a glossary and translation, was published by the distinguished Sanskrit scholar, Theodore Benfey. The text was settled by a comparison of the best manuscripts accessible. It may not be generally understood that we possess no Sanskrit manuscripts of an ancient date, since the climate of India makes their preservation difficult. Our oldest copies date back only a few hundred years. But copies were made as they were needed with extreme care. Such a reverence was felt for the text that not a letter or accentual mark could be changed.

The correct translation of the Vedas is a difficult matter. While many — perhaps nine-tenths — yield an obvious sense, there are some which are still enigmas. The dialect is so ancient, and so different from the modern Sanskrit, that many of the words have become obsolete, and their meaning can be conjecturally restored only by an exhaustive comparison of the passages in which they occur. True we have very old commentators on the Vedas, but he who applies to them for help is not long in finding that a desire to discover some sanction for later theological dogmas has often warped their judgment, and made them blind guides. Prof. Benfey, adopting a more independent and scientific course, applied the ordinary rules of interpretation, and produced a translation far better than his predecessor, and as good as could be expected of a translator twenty years ago. Yet he sometimes slips, and, besides, the labors of other scholars in this field during these years have yielded fruit, so that doubtless the

editor himself would doubtless wish to change many of his renderings.

The *Sâma-Veda* is the *Veda* of *sâman*, a word whose etymology is doubtful, but whose common meaning is a chant. This, then, is a collection of chants. The whole number of verses is 1808, of which 1733 also occur in the *Rig-Veda*. A considerable deduction, however, must be made for verses which are repeated once or more, which leaves 1549 as the number of distinct verses. The work is divided into two principal parts, and these into subordinate divisions, which need not be described here. Though nearly the whole of the *Sâma* is an extract from the *Rik*, we notice the peculiarity that most of the verses are wrested from their original connection, and that the law of their grouping is simply convenience in the ceremonial. This gives us the key to the true difference between the two Vedas. The *Sâma-Veda* is a purely liturgical collection designed to aid the worshiper in suitably presenting his offerings to the gods, while the *Rig-Veda* seems more like an "historical collection, prompted by a desire to treasure up complete and preserve from farther corruption those ancient and inspired songs which the Indian nation had brought with them, as their most precious possession, from the earlier seats of the race." But the form of the verses, as we find them in the ordinary text, is not that in which they were chanted. Technically a *sâman* is a "musically modulated verse." It may be compared to many of our lyric songs, when altered so as to correspond to the notes of the music. "It is not enough that they be simply accompanied by a musical utterance; they are also variously transformed by the protraction of their vowels, the insertion of sundry sounds, the resolution of semi-vowels, the addition of syllables and words, the repetition of portions of the verse, and the like." The "hymn and tune" books, which contain these transformed verses, are called *Gâna*. There are four of them connected with this *Veda*.

So much for the form. We turn now to the contents. While the hymns of the *Rik* embrace a considerable variety of sub-

jects, the verses of the Sâma are entirely devotional. Much the larger part of the invocations are addressed to the gods Indra and Agni, and to the Soma. Indra is the most conspicuous god of the Vedic pantheon. He is the god of the clear blue sky. He is called the "great-armed Indra," "the hurler of the lightning," whose power is as great as heaven itself. He derives his greatest renown from his contests with a demon called Vritra, the "Enveloper." This demon is believed to spread the clouds over the sky, excluding the sunlight. Indra cleaves the clouds with his thunder-bolt, slays Vritra, and restores the genial warmth of the sun. Sometimes the conception is varied; the rain-clouds are celestial cows whose milk is needed to moisten the parched earth, but Vritra has stolen, and fastened them in a mountain cavern. Indra hunts for them, and, cleaving the rocks, releases them; then refreshing showers again gladden his faithful worshipers. We are not to infer from the hymns addressed to him that Indra was the father and governor of the other gods, as was Zeus in Greece; for it was a fashion with the old poets to exalt the particular god whom they were praising to the highest rank. It is on account of the all-pervading and beneficent character of the light of day, that he so often and so prominently appears. He is often called the bull. He is strengthened by the sacrificial cakes, and is rendered furious by his favorite drink, the Soma. We quote a few verses here and there for illustration :

"We strengthen this Indra for the slaying of the mighty Vritra; let this bull be a bull indeed."

"The offering helped Indra when he enveloped the earth, having formed the cloud in the sky."

"Never-ceasing praises are to Indra; he brought forth waters from the depth of the sea; who hath by his might fixed apart earth and heaven as two wheels by an axle."

The hymns which accompany the offering serve to allure and strengthen the god.

"Songs as charioteers came to thee in the oblations, O praiseworthy one! They called thee as milch cows a calf."

"Come, let us praise Indra, the pure one, with a pure song; he is strengthened by pure hymns; let the beneficent one enjoy himself with the pure ones."

"For in truth the Soma, the intoxication, the prayer, have made thee stronger; O mightiest thunderer, with power drive from the earth the serpent, glorifying thyself in thy kingdom."

His chariot is drawn by a pair of cream-colored steeds.

"When battles arise, wealth is given to the brave; harness thy honey-dropping, ruddy steeds. Whom dost thou slay? To whom dost thou give riches? Thou givest us riches, Indra."

The next most frequently invoked god is Agni, fire. It is not strange that in the early age, when these hymns were composed, fire should be regarded as a divinity, whose favor was attended with great blessings, but whose wrath must be appeased with haste. These simple-minded people were singularly afraid of the darkness. This was the period when the Rakshas, the demons, were abroad, and wild beasts were ready to devour them or their cattle. Then Agni was kindled, and his flames dispelled the darkness, and kept off the beasts of prey and the evil spirits, whose forms could be discerned flitting about the outer circle of the light. The common mode of producing fire was by rubbing together two pieces of wood, hence Agni is generally represented as having a terrestrial origin, and the two sticks are called his mothers. In the further development of his personality, his chief office is that of a messenger from men to the gods. When the sacrificial butter was thrown into the fire, the flames grew brighter and rose higher and higher, which, perhaps, suggested the idea of a conveying away of the oblation. He also brought the gods to the feast in his chariot drawn by two fiery-colored steeds. As thus assisting at the offering he is often called the priest. We quote a few verses:

"Come hither, Agni, to the sacrifice; amid songs to the giving of the oblation; sit down as a priest upon the sacrificial grass."



"Thou, Agni, art set by the gods in the human family as a priest of all sacrifices."

"We supplicate Agni, the messenger, the all-knowing priest, the good-performer of this sacrifice."

"Protect us, Agni, by thy might from every enemy and human hater."

"Let Natsa (the poet) draw thy mind hither from any highest heaven. Thee, Agni, I endear by a hymn."

"Jâtavedas (Agni), placed in the two sticks, is beautifully borne as an infant by pregnant women. Day by day Agni is to be praised by watchful, offering-provided men."

"Men with the fingers, with rubbing of the two sticks of wood in the hand produced Agni, the excellent, the far-seeing one, the lord of the house, the friend of priests."

A petition for male offspring is frequent in the Vedas.

"Food, Agni, the offering of the cow, rich in works, make most lasting to the invoker. Let there be a son to us, Agni, branching male offspring; let this be thy favor to us."

We have had occasion to speak of the Soma-drink. The hymns addressed to the Soma are interesting and very numerous. It is the milky juice of a plant — the *asclepias acida* — growing abundantly in the mountainous districts of India and Persia. When it is fermented it intoxicates. The frenzy produced was regarded as an inspiration from a divinity residing in the plant. Hence the juice and all the instruments and processes employed in expressing it were sacred. Each act must be accompanied by an appropriate verse or formula. It was a favorite drink of the gods, who in its strength performed deeds of prodigious valor. The following are specimen verses:

"I pour for thee, O bull! Soma upon Soma for drinking. Drink! Receive the intoxication."

"What Soma is for thee, Indra, in the spoons, expressed between the boards, drink of this; thou art lord."

"O priest, lead through the sieve the stone-expressed Soma purify it for Indra to drink."

"The ten bedewing sisters (the fingers) purify him, th

swift prayers of the wise; the golden one, the offspring of the sun, flows around; as a swift horse he comes to the vessel."

"Stream good fortune to us, good fortune to the cattle, good fortune to man and the horse, good fortune, O king! to the plants."

Our description of the divinities invoked in the *Sâma* would be greatly deficient were we to pass by one who inspired the most truly poetic strains of the Vedic bards. We refer to *Ushas*, the dawn. It is at the dawn that the poet is relieved of the terrors of the night; the demons and beasts of prey slink off to their lairs, and the rest of the animate creation awakes to new activity. By a beautiful conception the dawn is regarded as a "virgin" in glittering robes, who chases away the darkness, or to whom her sister night willingly yields her domain; who prepares a path for the sun; is the signal for the sacrifice; rouses all beings from slumber; gives sight to the darkened; power of motion to the prostrate and helpless. The following are invocations addressed to her:

"The joy-giving maiden dawning around her sister (night), the daughter of heaven appears."

"The dawn, like a beautiful mare, ruddy, the mother of the cows (rays of light), provided with offerings, is the friend of the *Azvin*s."

"Thou art the friend of the *Azvin*s, the mother of the cows; thou rulest over riches, O Dawn!"

"O Dawn, rich in offerings! bring hither that beautiful thing to us by which we may have offspring and family."

"The Dawn, having a flaming child (the sun), hath approached; the dark one hath vacated her seats; the two kindred immortals, day and night, go, succeeding one another, exchanging color."

"The path of the sisters is uniform; one after another they go over it, instructed by the gods; they interfere not, nor stand still, the beneficent ones, Night and Dawn, like-minded, diverse-colored."

The *Azvin*s, mentioned in these verses, constantly appear in connection with the dawn. The word is always used in the

dual, and, according to its usual etymology, means the "pair of horsemen." They have been identified with the Dioscuri of the Greeks. Probably they represent some stage of the morning or evening twilight.

Several other gods, or classes of gods, are invoked in this Veda, of whom the Maruts or storm-winds are prominent. They are constant attendants upon Indra, and render him effectual aid in slaying the demons.

"All the gods, who were friends, fleeing before the threatening of Vritra, deserted thee (Indra). Let there be a friendship to thee with the Maruts; then thou mayest conquer all armies."

The god Varuna is an important personage in the Vedic pantheon. His name, which is kindred with the Greek *ὐρανός*, "heaven," is derived from a root *वृ*, "to cover." He was conceived of as the all-surrounding, enveloping one, and then as the arranger and moral governor of the universe. It is said of him:

"The butter-possessing benefactor of beings; the wide, broad, honey-dropping, beautiful-colored heaven and earth, never growing old, many-seeds-having, were fixed by Varuna's power."

Constantly surrounded by spies, who watch the deeds of men, he is strict to reward virtue and punish vice. The prayers which are raised to him crave forgiveness of sin more than riches or offspring.

The Hindu triad of gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, was unknown to the Vedic poets. Brahma and Siva are not named at all, Vishnu but seldom. In the Vedas, Vishnu probably represents the sun. His great exploit was to stride through heaven in three steps, which refers to the sun at his rising, zenith, and setting.

"Vishnu hath stepped through this (sky); three times did he set his foot down; it is enveloped in his dust."

Though we have by no means exhausted the list of divinities, this will perhaps suffice to give a glimpse of the theology of the old Aryans, and at the same time of the contents of the

Sâma-Veda. More abundant and more interesting illustrations might have been drawn from the Rig-Veda, where whole hymns are found in their original form. Though the Sâma is the most uninteresting of the four Vedas, yet it has considerable importance from the fact that where the same verse occurs both in the Rik and in the Sâma, the latter has often a slightly different and *older* reading. This would indicate that the Sâma collection was made earlier than the Rik.

Much has already been done toward elucidating the Vedas, and the fruit has abundantly rewarded the labor, by the light which it has thrown upon ethnology, the science of language, and the origin and development of religious belief. Still, much more remains to be done before we can say that we fully understand these most ancient of human records.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### FIFTEEN MINUTES' TALK ABOUT COLLEGES.

We have just passed the annual harvests in the fields of agriculture and in the fields of literature. By an old arrangement, now nearly obsolete, the College Commencements were held after the hay and grain were gathered, so that the farmers' sons and daughters, and the community in general, might be at leisure to attend the literary festivities. But in the vicinity of the old New England colleges we fear there are few farmers' sons and daughters left that care to go. There are changes in the *relations* of the colleges and the community, as great as in the two factors themselves, whereof the issue is not yet clear. After all the discussions and changes, neither Young America nor Old seems fully to have mastered the situation. There is a helpless groping and experimenting going on among our higher institutions of learning, that sadly indicates the lack of some master mind or minds to clear away the fog and find the path. Something is to be done, but no one knows what. We

do not propose to attempt the solution ; but we offer some hints.

The worst of the case, as it seems to us, is the confusion of ideas in the minds of men of culture themselves. They have suffered themselves to be overpowered by a mere popular and unreasoning clamor. It is certainly indispensable that they should consider the vast modern expansion in the realms of learning, and that an education should be adjusted towards it, and gauged, as it were, with reference to it ; but not overwhelmed and inundated by it. Yet the *essential* character of liberal education is, was, and will be, the same. It is that which makes *a man master of his faculties, and so fits him to master his surroundings*. The discipline and unfolding of himself *symmetrically* is therefore the fundamental thing. We can not do for him the impossible work of making him know all knowledge, but we can prepare him so that in any circumstances he will be able to know whatever he needs to know : whether as lawyer, clergyman, statesman, financier, civil engineer, or what not. In giving this training, it is proper and indispensable that even in the process it be adjusted to the present rather than the past. Such a preliminary training can really go but little way in the details of any of the sciences ; it can only lay a right foundation for their further prosecution. That foundation it should lay, and so far should deal with things as they are, and not as they were. But this rule will not exclude everything not born in this century. The science of mathematics, that can never be displaced, is, much of it, two thousand years old. The lessons of history become fully instructive only as we recede from the excitements of contemporaries. Even the shifting theories of science require sifting. It may also be found, after all the outcry, that the study of the classic tongues, so rich in philological, literary and historic suggestiveness, so inwoven with all modern speech and thought, and especially, when rightly pursued, so various and vigorous a drill and stimulant of all the intellectual faculties, can not find a substitute. The difficulty in this matter has been twofold. (1.) They have been defended

in a very inadequate manner, on far too low and superficial grounds. (2.) They have been taught in too narrow a way. Classical teachers have not waked up to the progress of the last fifty years even in their own department. They do not comprehend the broad and fertile field thrown open by modern linguistic study, and they continue to teach in the old hum-drum way — sometimes with a most industrious and heedless pedantry. With all our profound respect for classical study, it does seem to us that in the wonderful opening of modern knowledge, it is a dreary waste of time to drill young men, as in the Boston Latin School, in making Latin and Greek Hexameters. We would as soon go back to the Trivium and the Quadrivium.

Meanwhile many of our educators have been misled by the popular hue and cry into the idea that a liberal education is to a mastery of science or of art, or some kind of professional, or technical, or business training, or a qualification for making money.

In this state of confusion, where no one knows what is the trouble, every one comes with his remedy. It is elective studies; or more German and French; or science and art; or more rhetoric and oratory; or more æsthetics; or abundant prizes; or the abolition of college distinctions; or picture galleries and fine buildings, and great libraries, and great endowments; or post-graduate courses; or the government by the Alumni; or the admission of young women; and we know not what else.

Perhaps the notion of physically great institutions has been made prominent enough, and too much so. Men who should know better, so far give in to false notions as to argue as though the relative greatness of Yale and Harvard depended on their respective number of students. Let the public be disabused. This subject has more than one side. Much can, indeed, be said in favor of condensing all the colleges of New England into one or two, as the great manufactories swallow the little ones. It accumulates larger libraries and apparatus, and perhaps more distinguished instructors, and greater variety of

lectures. It creates greater division of labor in the instruction, and gathers a vaster atmosphere of scholarship around the student. It magnifies the impressiveness of the Institution before the community and the student. It brings together more talent and greater variety of thinking among the students.

But there are some compensations in the smaller institutions, if properly managed. Their teachers, if less distinguished, are often more industrious, and especially more devoted to their work. Harvard has had many ornamental appendages. Men who have yet to make their mark, are apt to toil harder than those who have made it. When classes become large there are not professors enough, and much of the instruction is committed to inexperienced tutors. For years in some of the larger colleges nearly all the instruction of two classes has been thus given; while in some smaller colleges all the instruction has been given by permanent professors. The closer intercourse, also, of the smaller classes with the permanent officers, is often a compensation for much else. There have been times when Vermont University and Williams College have given a much better training than other much more popular and populous institutions. In the larger institutions it is often the case that the students form a public sentiment of their own and bear down the Faculty, both in discipline and in study. It was, for instance, the complaint some years ago of a religious editor who was a graduate of Yale, that this sentiment was so strong there at that time as to put down true scholarship by the popular substitution of general literature, debates, club interests, and the like. We remember hearing another distinguished teacher say that in a certain institution the Faculty found it impossible to teach Whately's Logic above a certain point in the college course, because the classes would not submit. The crowd of rich idlers that throng a great and popular institution are apt to create a low sentiment of study; while the poorer young men in the smaller colleges are there to get an education. As colleges grow older and wealthier, like Dartmouth and Amherst, it is quite noticeable how the percentage of students for the ministry falls off. Great colleges also multi-



ply temptations, and in various ways increase expenses. As to the larger libraries, an under-graduate needs few books after all. Many books are more for the Faculty than for the students. With all the advantages of large institutions, therefore, it must be remembered there are advantages in the smaller ones. A college is not like a professional school, or a university. Its students are, as they call themselves, "boys," and are best taught, not by lecture, but chiefly by recitation. And there is a medium size of classes that is practically better managed and taught than more unwieldy ones. In a great college the students often do the larger portion of the educating process, in a small one the Faculty. Meanwhile the general interest of the community is better subserved by a reasonable number of colleges than by their extreme consolidation. Six or eight colleges in New England, we are persuaded, are far better for all concerned than two would be.

We doubt whether extensive election of studies is to accomplish what is expected. College boys do not know what they need, nor one-fourth part of the parents. It is wiser for those who do know, to adjust certain parallel *courses* and provide for them. In this way not only the immense stimulus and constant attrition of permanent classes is secured, and the greater economy of teaching and teachers in procuring instruction, but a better work is done for the student. It is no more arbitrary to adopt general courses of study than text-books. One evil in literary institutions is the employment of so many instructors who have had no other experience than that of teaching. They have never been expanded by professional study, much less by professional experience. They run in the narrow track of the *pedagogue*. The truth is, in any permanent department of college instruction there is wanted a man. And no man is fully developed till he has in some way grappled with real life. While it will not answer for one who is to be a college teacher to have spent the best portion of his life in other spheres of labor, on the other hand he can not easily dispense with some actual experience among men. Such experience will impart a breadth, depth, power and

wisdom to his teachings, which few men can otherwise attain. The lack of this manly expansion in the teachers has more to do with the popular questionings concerning college education than anything in the curriculum. If Lyman Beecher missed it in entering the teacher's chair after a life of pastoral labor, scores of other men fail of making their mark as teachers, because they never have been anything but pupils and pedagogues. Out of this fact grows the contracted and unproductive method in which they have taught the noble themes committed to their charge. It is a great blessing for a college Faculty now to number in its Board one or more men who are themselves examples of broad and manly culture and robust thinking; men who have thought out their own department in its relation to the great unity of knowledge and thought and life. Debility in the teachers may easily be mistaken for decay of the system of education. We can think of colleges that can scarcely show a strong man on their Board of Instruction. Weighed down with third-rate teachers. Give us men to educate men. On this account, too, we believe that there are important advantages in having part of the instruction, if not the superintending control, of young ladies' institutions in the hands of men. For a man can bring to the presidency of such an institution a breath of experience which is unattainable by a woman, except in such rare cases as that of Mary Lyon. It is really the only *good* reason we can think of why so many young women are rather fiercely demanding admission into the boys' colleges that do not want them, and scorning to attend the girls' colleges that do.

The annual crop of Doctorates of Law and Divinity has appeared. Scores of persons who were little men last year are great men now. These things indicate various qualifications. In perhaps two cases out of ten they mean scholarly distinction — as they ought. In the other eight cases they mean no such thing. Harvard, years ago, did herself the dishonor of conferring a literary honor on a merely military hero — an LL.D. on stout General Jackson. Jack Downing, at the time, got it slightly wrong by saying that the degree

was A.S.S., and meant "Amazing Smart Scholar." We see that after the lapse of forty years brave Phil Sheridan is made to lift a young university into notoriety in the same way. As we think over the list of these degrees in the past and the present, we see that a degree sometimes means that a man has lived inoffensively in the ministry for many years, and has a large circle of wealthy friends or parishioners. In one case it meant that a man had been a good college agent in raising money. In one instance it meant having a very rich parishioner; in another, a rich father-in-law; in a third, being the son of a retiring, aggrieved functionary. In one case a Doctorate of Laws signified ten thousand dollars virtually contracted for, as some persons maliciously said, and cheap at that. In another case a gentleman informed us he was assured by a college treasurer that a much less sum would bring a Doctorate of Divinity. The gentleman wisely did not think it worth the money. In one instance it means that a rector has been abused by his bishop. In another an Honorary Degree means that a man has been a lawyer without a tinge of literature, but has accumulated a good little fortune at the law, and now grows old. In one instance it means that a man's friends have resolutely dogged a Board of Trust till they surrendered. In one case it signifies a good Presbyterian or a good Congregationalist, or a leading Baptist. In another case it signifies that a man is in charge of an academy that sends boys to college. Some of the minor honorary degrees in one college mean thus: Success in the wholesale grocers' business, coupled with advanced years; success in the dry goods' business, ditto; a fortune accumulated in railroads, ditto; an election as Governor after a close struggle; in several instances membership in the State legislature and great activity in party politics where State legislation was desired, and so on. These things have heaped more discredit on colleges than all else. The institutions have degraded themselves. We have no conscientious scruples against conferring literary honors. The passage in the New Testament, often quoted, is simply a rebuke of personal ambi-

tion, and does not touch the case of honors *not sought*, but *bestowed*. But let literary honors be literary honors. Let not the institutions of learning thus cheapen their own wares and make themselves ridiculous before the world. If these things are to continue, it would be well to modify the degrees a little after Jack Downing's hint. Let A.M. be occasionally changed to A.P.M., Master of Political Arts; A.B. to W.B., Wealthy Bachelor, or, in view of the coming woman, Widow of Beauty. D.D.G. might stand for Doctor of Dry Goods; F.M. ambiguously for Father in the Ministry or Fair Maid; F.R.S. might be conferred, meaning either Son of a Retiring Functionary, Son of a Fortunate Railroader, or Friend of a Rich Sinner. Plain D.D. unchanged will do for Dignified and Devout, Dry-as-Dust, Doubtful Doctor, Desirous of Distinction, or Dogged in Demanding. LL.D. is already understood to cover the cases, Devoid of Literature and Learning, as well as Destitute of Legal Lore. The degree of A.B., by a little artful extension, would have expressed "Abused by his Bishop," just as well, without the trouble and waste of a D.D. Two or three wholly new cabalistic combinations would be found highly useful, although at first they would look a little odd. We venture to suggest, then, F.O.G., B.D.P.D., and W.D.T.V.D. The first of these would soon enter into universal use, and would be a highly popular substitute for D.D., as it could signify ambiguously Fine Old Gentleman, or Fast on the Gospels; the second would be exceedingly convenient for the eager college which will soon pick up the author of Jim Bludsoe, and means Doctor of Bull-Dog Poetry; the last should be reserved for the President of the college most fertile in foolish degrees, and would mean Doctor of Ways that are Dark and Tricks that are Vain. It would create a lively competition in certain quarters; but we can guess who would win.

It would not injure some of the older institutions to import a little more common sense into their discipline, and to expurgate their college laws. A code of college laws, as we remember, is a formidable catalogue, loaded with disused, as

well as with useless, restrictions and requirements; relics of a cumbrous past. In administering them it has seemed to us there was often a sad confounding of merely technical with moral offenses, and frequently an altogether unnecessary entanglement in discipline. One of the most long-winded Faculty investigations we remember, attended with reprimands, and even one or two suspensions, grew out of five minutes merely *thoughtless* kicking of a foot-ball in the space between two college buildings. We remember another case in which a dull professor did his best to make a case of discipline, but failed. A military company was parading on the green near by, when two college lads of seventeen appeared in disguise as Falstaff and Prince Hal, *en militaire*. They were greeted with shouts of laughter, and there would have been the end of it. But the vigilant professor came forth, crept round in the crowd, and at length made a dive at the lads. But as his legs were of the same heaviness as his other understanding, and as honest Jack had not forgotten how to run since the "road by Gadshill," here was a case of discipline marred in the making. Pity that many others had not been spoiled as early and as easily.

It is a matter of regret that college expenses have increased so enormously within a generation. The increase is out of all proportion to other changes of cost. Much of it we fear is arbitrary and unnecessary, caused by a false sentiment, the result of extravagant habits. It nevertheless rests as imperatively and as heavily on those who can ill afford it. We can not look for the time when Dr. Samuel Woods drove his cow to Hanover, and, though no calf he, lived mainly by her good offices. But we grieve to see the time go by when the ministers and small farmers could send their sons to college, and when a young man with some aid could even push his way, though by the hardest. These were the classes from which MEN came. That time is nearly past. It takes a man of some fortune to educate a family of sons in college now, at the cheapest of *good* New England institutions. Alas for it.

We only add for the benefit of the inexperienced, that lite-

rary institutions have always found it as impolitic as it was dishonest to appoint a President or a Professor for any other reason than precisely his literary fitness for the place. We have seen the experiment repeatedly tried, but it always was a failure. We have seen a man appointed Professor because he could raise his endowment; but he could not. We have known an appointment made in the hope that a rich father would provide for the son's chair. So he did, but only for the time of its occupancy. We have known Presidents appointed chiefly because they could raise money. But it was dear money. And when the money was raised, he would neither die nor go.

The attempt to manage literary institutions on any other basis than their own legitimate principles — by providing by some one's friends or otherwise — has always proved a blunder.

## THE BOOK TABLE.

---

MANUAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By Henry Fawcett, M.A., M.P., Prof. Pol. Econ., Univ. Camb., England. London: Macmillan. Pp. 533.

The author of this book is somewhat better known just now for having voted, "solitary and alone," against the dowry of the princess who has become Marchioness of Lorne, than as a writer on Political Economy. To Englishmen he is better known as the parliamentary leader of what are called "Political Dissenters," *i. e.*, those who would overthrow the Establishment for political rather than religious reasons. He is a frequent and effective speaker in the House of Commons on all questions of administration and of reform. Like every other true English Liberal, he is earnest in advocating national education. In the literature of political controversy his pen is not idle. He is well approved as a university instructor. Such a man could hardly make a book on Political Economy which would not be valuable. This volume is the best representative, within manageable compass, of the best English thinking. It is portable, compact, not too large, clear in its order, unusually lucid, easy, comprehensible in style, written in simple, unpretending English, and abounding in apt examples and illustrations. Many of the titles show how *thoroughly English* it is; *e. g.*, "The classes among whom wealth is distributed," "Rents as determined by competition," "Peasant proprietors," "Metayers and Cottiers, and the Economical Aspects of Tenant-Right," "Trades Unions," "Over-production," "the Income-Tax," "the Land-Tax and Poor-Rates," "the Poor Law." Such discussions as those on Pauperism and on National Education as a remedy for low wages, could never occur in an American work.

One point in which Mr. Fawcett's style of thinking differs from that of American authors is in considering the subject entirely and only in the light of the total wealth of the community. One of our authors—especially if of the school of Carey—starts with the individual; he shows at the outset how distribution of labor, exchange, etc., come to be primarily possible. A British writer ignores all that; he starts with the British Empire, whose opulence, greatness and glory are, in his view, the end of Political Economy. Thus, Prof. Fawcett's first book—94 pages—is on the Production of Wealth; but it is wealth in which the real producer—the English laborer—has no share. Land, labor and capital are its three requisites, and but a small and diminishing class of Englishmen can have either land or capital. So when he comes to discuss "Foreign Commerce or Interna-



tional Trade" (Book III. Exchange. Chap. VII.), his great argument for "free trade" is that it increases wealth — *i. e.*, the wealth of capitalists and land-owners, for no others in England have any "wealth" to be increased. Much that he says of the advantage of interchanges of commodities is true, irrespective of the controverted questions. The laborer's interest in the matter is put in this way: "Foreign commerce economizes labor and capital, and therefore must exert *some* tendency toward increasing the *nominal* wages of the laborer." The economy of labor and capital here meant is secured to England, for example, by driving foreign industry out of occupations that compete with English ones. When the author says: "Free trade enables the labor and capital of each country to work with maximum efficiency," he means in increasing aggregate wealth. But who can show that the increase of England's aggregate wealth — *the present relations of "classes" continuing* — would be a blessing? So when he admits that particular classes of consumers may be injured by foreign commerce — *i. e.*, by importing instead of producing certain articles — this is evidently no objection to him, if the mass of wealth in the hands of the wealthy classes is increased. He recognizes the interest of England — *i. e.*, of her over-wealthy classes — in having "free trade" adopted by other nations, and that in "almost every other country" the opposite doctrine prevails, and even "the great body of the workingmen are ardent protectionists."

On the whole, this is the best *English* treatise on the Science of Political Economy we have ever seen.

SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY, AND RELIGION: Lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute, Boston. By Prof. John Bascom, Williams College. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons. 1871. Pp. 311.

This interesting and able volume illustrates the fact that on great themes many accomplished writers may publish books, all of which shall be attractive and profitable. The theme has room enough in it for large discursiveness. There is range for a vast amount of penetrative and instructive thought. Such topics as Dr. McCosh discussed in his *Lectures on Positivism* are here thrown into new lights and relations, and illustrated with much greater freshness and force. It strikes us as far the best written of Prof. Bascom's publications. In former volumes we confess to some disappointment. The promise they made was hardly fulfilled. The thought contained less that was satisfying than we had been led to expect. The author set out upon a journey in which he came short of the goal in view. In the present work, though the title is of course too ample to be exhausted in so small a book — twelve lectures, — yet the first lecture hardly gives notice of the depth and richness of thought that succeed. Prof. Bascom is specially felicitous, moreover, in comparison and figurative elucidation. The style, too, is neat, but affluent, often combining unusual strength and elegance. One exception is the use of the word "unbeknown," — barely recognized as colloquial.

Mental Philosophy is here vindicated and exalted, from first to last, as

standing between Natural Science and Religion, giving validity and form to each. It is treated as, *par excellence*, Philosophy. After a general defense of it as inevitable to mind and necessary to progress and character, Prof. B. discusses the relation of Primitive Ideas, or Intuitions, to Knowledge, and then "Space, the field; Causation, the law of facts;" Matter, Consciousness, Right, Liberty, Life, Mind, and the Interaction of Forces, closing with the Classification of Knowledge as related to Mental Philosophy. Comparing lecture with lecture, the IVth, in which the proposed substitute for Causation of Mill, Spencer and Bain is exploded, strikes us as the most complete and satisfactory. It is entitled "Resemblance not the Sole Law of Thought." The analysis is acute and clear, the reasoning strong and convincing. The points made are: 1, The primitive character of causation; 2, Its exclusive application to physical events; 3, Its absolute necessity for their apprehension; 4, The impossibility of substituting any other idea for it; 5, It is a common ground of activity between us and God. The subtlest and most dangerous modern assault upon religion so gathers about this intuition of Causal Power that a successful exposition of it is a grand service done to the Truth; and Prof. Bascom's is eminently successful. His discussion of the intuition of Right involves some consideration of Dr. Hopkins's style of Utilitarianism. There is hardly a form of new scientific thought — like the views of Huxley, Darwin, etc. — but is touched from its metaphysical side — the side on which their errors are weakest and truth is strongest. Such books show that the old New-England keenness and power in higher philosophical thought has not oozed away yet.

SUBSTANCE AND SHADOW, ETC., ETC.: An Essay upon the Plagues of Creation. By Henry James. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. Pp. 539.

Plunging into the middle of this volume of antique type and unique thought, we found the author belaboring two men of such size in philosophy as Hamilton and Kant. The next discovery was that the book was written to show that Swedenborg is the great physical and metaphysical philosopher to whom all others should bow. As an essayist Mr. James has achieved considerable reputation. He has critical power, literary skill, taste, acuteness, and force; but his best qualities do not shine in this attempt in the field of speculation. He does not always preserve intellectual dignity. One of his running titles is, "Sir William Hamilton degrades Philosophy into Snivel." Another is, "He finds the cause of a thing always on the thing's own Intestines." Another is, "The stupendous antics of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel." Another is, "Sir William Hamilton runs Kant's Doctrine into the Ground." He calls Science intruding into the domain of Philosophy, a "mousing owl." Dr. Bushnell's Nature and the Supernatural is said to "stand in the same relation to our ordinary characteristic theology that an ox fed on oil-cake does to average beef." The orthodox theology is caricatured and misrepresented — *e. g.*, it is said to "make creation a mere *impromptu* spurt of the Divine Power, as essentially wanton or capricious as that whereby an idle horseman with a stroke

of his whip lays low the head of an aspiring thistle." He seems to characterize worship as "transparent monkey-shines of a mock devotion." Setting forth God's desire to draw us into sympathetic fellowship with Himself he says, that if He saw us spontaneously disposed thereto, "He would be more than content never to get a genuflexion from us again while the world lasted, nor hear another of our dreary litanies while sheep bleat and calves bellow." He does not think we are much better off for revelation. "Compared with heathen nations, we are indeed as baked apples to green; but I do not see that apples plucked green from the tree and assiduously cooked, as we have been, are near so likely to ripen in the long run as those which are still left hanging upon the boughs, exposed to God's unstinted sun and air." Only Swedenborg can ripen us!

One of the singular things about this book is the habit of the author of putting a new and unwarranted sense upon familiar words of established meaning. It is more than Dr. Bushnell's fashion of departing somewhat from the settled English significations: Mr. James makes entire departures. Thus, morality with him is "a sentiment of selfhood or property in one's own body!" and religion is a sense of the loss of God's favor, and an impulse to make sacrifices to regain it. Thus, too, "infinite," as applied to God's love to man, is made to mean, "untainted by the least admixture of love to Himself," or "unlimited by self-love." So non-existence is spoken of as a nature—i. e., an existent one! subjected to death; and this is vivified (or brought out of non-existence into existence) by the Creator's allowing His infinitude to be "swallowed up in the finiteness" of the (non-existent) creature!

The caricature Mr. James gives of the orthodox doctrine of Atonement, founding it on the ascription of "essential malignity," or a "Divine appetite for vengeance" to God, we shall not allow ourselves to quote. It is quite in keeping with this that he should call the Christian Church "an embodiment of our sottishness in divine things," "the refuge and citadel of a frenzied egotism and unbelief."

NOTES, PRACTICAL AND EXPOSITORY, ON THE GOSPELS. By Charles H. Hall, D D, Brooklyn, N. Y. Hurd & Houghton. Pp. 428 and 400.

Barnes, Jacobus, Ripley, and the rest, who are accepted expositors with their respective denominations, are here followed by a well-read Episcopal rector, who aims to do a like service for his own sect. The execution is creditable, the learning employed respectable, though not so high as prevails in non-Episcopal circles, the style less careless and prolix than in some popular commentaries, neater and more fitting, and the illustrations, maps, etc., sufficient for the limited purposes contemplated. Dr. Hall is careful to say that his Notes are "respectfully offered to *churchmen*;" he devoutly quotes the Liturgy here and there; he makes it part of his preface to Mark's Gospel to inform us that "the Feast of St. Mark occurs April 25," following this with the "Collect for St. Mark's Day"; he says a good word for "our

church," when he conveniently can; he supports his interpretations by the Fathers, in place of the most learned and accepted commentators; and he accompanies his acknowledgment of obligation to Barnes for the form of his own work, with the disclaimer—"No *opinion* of Mr. B. has been copied, since, so far as they were peculiar to him, they were novelties." In his Introduction he says: "Think who wrote the Christian Scriptures—*Christian Bishops*. Who have guarded them in all ages? *Christian Bishops*. Who have taught you how to think by creed, prayer, etc.? The ministers, the mothers and fathers of the Church. \* \* \* The doctrines of the Church, as they appear in the Prayer Book, are the true guide to you in the study of the Gospels." In the Preface to this (second) edition he avows that his idea is "to present the liturgical forms of the piety of the Church, as the proper commentary on both the words and deeds of Christ \* \* \* Therefore the Prayer Book has been largely incorporated in the Notes. It was believed that Christian teachers of the young would in this way catch the spirit of our well-ordered services," etc. etc. A commentary less sectarian in purpose and shaping is more to our taste.

THE PHYSICAL CAUSE OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST, AND ITS RELATION TO THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF CHRISTIANITY. By Wm. Stroud, M.D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. Pp. 422. 12mo. Price \$2.00.

The chief point of this monograph (a republication) is to show that the immediate *physical* cause of the Saviour's death was not the ordinary sufferings of crucifixion, but an actual rupture of the heart, as the consequence of intense mental emotion. The case is ably argued, both negatively and positively, by a skillful and eminent physician, strongly reinforced by other competent opinions, and the conclusion made to appear highly probable. A greater amount of information is here collected in regard to the phenomena of crucifixion, bloody sweat, the effect of emotion in producing lesion of the heart, and related topics, than it is easy to find elsewhere. If the mind at first recoils at such a surgical analysis of this stupendous redemptive act, it is well to remember that in such a discussion, if valid, we have—*first*, a remarkable and unexpected testimony of science to the most artless of narratives; and, *secondly*, a singular confirmation of the intensity of the spiritual conflict with which our salvation was purchased. The related doctrinal discussions of the volume are interesting, as the views of a devout and intelligent layman, and few students of the Bible will fail to derive many valuable suggestions from the entire treatise.

BOSTON LECTURES, 1871. Christianity and Skepticism; comprising a Treatment of Questions in Biblical Criticism. Boston: Cong. Pub. Society. Chicago: G. S. F. Savage. Pp. 473. 12mo. \$2.

Including the Introductory one, here are eleven lectures mostly by well-known and able men. They are as follows: The Relations of the Bible to the Civilization of the Future, by Prof. Phelps. The Primeval Revelation,

by Prof. Mead, of Andover. Moses, by Dr. J. P. Thompson. Joshua and Judges; or, The Heroic Age of Israel, by Prof. Tyler. The Hebrew Theocracy, by Dr. Bacon. The Prophet Isaiah, by Dr. John Lord. The Gospel of the Hebrew Prophets, by Dr. Cheever. The Apostle Paul, by Prof. Fisher. Criticism Confirmatory of the Gospels, by Prof. Thayer. Jesus Christ himself the All-sufficient Evidence of Christianity, by Prof. Talcott. Exclusive Traits of Christianity, by Dr. Hopkins. To enter upon any intelligent criticism of so many diverse discussions would be impracticable; we will not, therefore, undertake to characterize individual lectures. It is enough for us to announce them, and to say that they claim to be, and are, "a Series of Studies" upon the Bible, "not assuming to form a systematic treatise or an exhaustive discussion of all the great questions respecting it;" that they are to a good degree popular in their method, as well as thoughtful in character; that some of them are of very marked interest and ability; and that as a whole they constitute a quickening and profitable course of reading, both for ministers and laymen, and are well adapted to keep them informed of the present aspects of religious discussion. The volume should find its way into their libraries.

**TREATISE ON REGENERATION.** By William Anderson, LL.D., Glasgow. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. Chicago: H. A. Sumner. Pp 311. 12mo.

The subject-matter of this volume is treated in seven sections: the nature of regeneration—the necessity—the instrumentality—the actuating agency—its state as produced and developed—its procuring cause, and its manifestation. The arguments under these several heads are extended and conclusive in character. Native depravity is accounted for on the privation theory (p. 65). The whole discussion, with a very few exceptions, is carefully discriminative. The composition is in sermon style, and much of it rather loose at that. Sentences of infelicitous construction are not rare. The following (on p. 40) would bear retouching with profit: "But there are mysteries enough in our faith without any one should make gratuitous, superstitious additions to them."

If, on the next revision of the work, it should be thoroughly sifted and portions of it recast, a volume considerably reduced would be more edifying to the reader and more creditable to the author.

**THE ATONEMENT: IN ITS RELATION TO THE COVENANT, THE PRIESTHOOD, AND THE INTERCESSION OF OUR LORD.** By Rev. Hugh Martin, M.A. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. Chicago: H. A. Sumner. Pp. 288. 12mo.

The author, a Scotchman, a close thinker and lucid writer, has given a thorough discussion of the subject, as he understands it. The theology of the discussion is Federal, and corresponds substantially with the Westminster exposition. Our limits allow only a few beacon points along the vigorous march of the discussion. All sinners one with Adam; all believers one

with Christ. Christ bears the sin of all believers, and His righteousness is imputed to them, as the ground of their justification. Christ died, not simply as a passive sufferer, but, as an acting priest, offered Himself a sacrifice, and thus fulfilled an essential condition in the covenant of grace, thereby laying a sure foundation for His office, as intercessor. Hence his intercession has not for its object to influence the Father to do what otherwise He would be unwilling to do, but officially to present a fulfilled condition in a plan of salvation which originated in the love of God. Christ, in the sacrifice of Himself, was for our sake treated as a sinner, just as we for His sake are treated as righteous. Conversely, He was made sin for us, in the same sense that we are "made the righteousness of God in Him."

The atonement in its provisions is ample for all, but in its application is limited to the elect. Mr. M. does not recommend to modern preachers the antiquated formulas of statement, but earnestly contends for the root and essence of the matter, as discussed in his book.

We do not indorse all the statements of the volume in form and strength; and yet, while so many weak dilutions of the doctrine are abroad, in which we are told that Christ was simply a self-sacrifice as a grand example of self-denial, or a sacrifice as a law of being, or a martyr to produce a sublime moral effect, or a governmental display, etc., it is refreshing to read so thorough a discussion, founded not on a philosophical theory which may be received to-day and exploded to-morrow, but on Biblical interpretation. We cordially recommend the volume to the careful reading, especially of the younger ministers. Coming after the perusal of some other treatises, it will be as roast beef after a diet of water-gruel.

**THE PIOUS DEAD OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION.** By Henry J. Brown, A.M., M.D. Philadelphia: Higgins & Perkinpine. Pp. 320.

It is well sometimes to take men religiously on the side of their occupations in life and professional education. Dr. Brown attempts this in eight brief, well-drawn biographical sketches of medical men. We see only matter for commendation in the design and the execution. Three short and interesting essays are prefixed, on the Cross in the Life—Union—in Nature—in Medicine.

**ELEMENTS OF ASTRONOMY.** By J. Norman Lockyer, editor of "Nature," F.R.A.S., etc. New York: Appletons. Pp. 312.

Lockyer ranks abroad, as an author, with such men as Aisy. MacMillan's edition of his *Elements* is here condensed and adapted to American use. Some practical additions are made, and Arago's *Charts* of both Celestial Hemispheres appended. Lockyer makes good use of *Spectrum Analysis*, and his own discoveries. The book is "up" in the latest results; the order of topics, beginning with the stars, more easy and natural than that of other treatises; the style of explanation and statement lucid and terse; the colored and other illustrations abundant and superior.

**QUALITATIVE CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.** By Charles W. Elliot and Frank H. Storer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. New York: Van Nostrand. Pp. 191.

One of these authors has, since this publication, and that of Elliot and Storer's *Inorganic Chemistry*, become President of Harvard. This book discloses how he would use analytical scientific study as a means of intellectual discipline, especially in reasoning and the attainment of truth. The discovery of the elements contained in compound substances is here pursued chiefly in respect to inorganic solids and liquids, and comprises thirty-four chemical elements out of sixty-five. It is hardly necessary to say that the text-book is one of great merit, and singularly compact and satisfactory.

**THE LIFE OF BISMARCK, PRIVATE AND POLITICAL.** By J. G. L. Hessekiel. From the German. New York: Harper & Bros. Pp. 491.

We could advise none but reviewers to attempt the first eighty pages of this goodly volume. There is a heavy introduction by the English translator, an interminable and elaborate genealogy and family history, and a series of sketches of Bismarck's homes. The author reaches the 101st page before he gets his hero even born. After that, with true German minuteness and exhaustiveness, he goes through the details of his childhood, school-days, and youth, his wild "mad," roystering university life at Berlin, Göttingen, and Berlin again,—at the latter university his study companion being our Minister and historian Motley, his boon companions, army officers,—his marriage, domestic and agricultural life, entrance upon political duties, membership in Diet and Upper Chamber, ambassadorship, premiership, and who's public career. He was born at Schenhausen, where he first resided, the estate from which his new title of Baron is derived, April 1, 1815. His full name is Otto Edward Leopold. He belongs to the North German knightly families, the landed aristocracy of Saxony and Brandenburg. A vein of rollicking humor, an intense relish for the broadly comical, ran through his early days. Who would recognize the grave, ascetic, imperturbable, sternly-purposed statesman in the writer of this description of a table companion at a rural hotel? "A fat frog without legs, who opens his mouth before every morsel like a carpet-bag, right up to his shoulders, so that I am obliged to hold on to the table for giddiness." A robust man is Bismarck, of powerful physical make, and all his days a great horseman and ardent hunter. Heligoland, in the North Sea, which he has just demanded from England, was one of his youthful resorts. He was evidently a hard drinker and smoker, but a hard thinker too, an unusual combination. He cut university lectures, and read up for examinations like a race horse. An intense royalist from the start, holding to sovereignty and thrones by divine right, the inflexible foe of democracy and liberalism, with love for the Prussian army running "like a red line" through his whole political life; a man of firm countenance, and cold glance, imperious and fearless; believing implicitly that Prussia must be distinct-



ively Prussian, that is, un-French, un-English; unchangeably conservative in everything, accepting the constitution of King Frederic William in 1847 against his will, "because he must," but silently resolving to make the king monarch more monarchical in due time; as unlike an American statesman, or a Bright, or Gladstone, as could well be, about equally resolute in dyking out the sea and republicanism; his long yellowish-gray overcoat, as well-known as Mr. Greeley's white one, a sarcastic and waggish story-teller on occasion, a terse, tense writer, a somewhat hard, but sententious, forcible, commanding speaker, holding the independent supremacy of the Prussian crown high above every other object of state, "at every cost," yet advocating popular representation; chatty, witty, picturesque in his private letters, salting speech and written expression often with a blunt and peculiar humor; full of courtly dignity in society, and of homely heartiness in his family and in his woods; a man of intense devotion to his ideas, never popular, and everywhere admired; neither a Cavour nor a Garibaldi, but intellectually greater than either; *that* is Bismarck. He has succeeded by power of thought, and power of opinion and policy. Read his letters in order to know him. It is cheering to find him revisiting Wiesbaden — "the scene of former folly" — and writing: "Would it might please God to fill this vessel with His clear and strong wine, in which formerly the champagne of twenty-one years of youth foamed uselessly and left nothing but loathing behind."

The sprightly portions of this book are auto-biographical — viz., the unique Bismarckian letters. They show almost an artist's eye for scene and color. Over one hundred telling and apt illustrations adorn the volume, which is, perhaps, the most important biography of the twelvemonth past.

**THE BIBLE DEFENDED, ETC.** By Rev. W. H. Brisbane. Philadelphia: Higgins & Peralpine. Pp. 179.

With a sensible introduction on the infidel strategy, and a convenient topical index, this little book is fitted to remove some difficulties and neutralize some objections made against revelation. It is very limited, of course, in its range. Our Methodist brethren have not wrought in this field so largely as others hitherto.

**PLANE PROBLEMS IN ELEMENTARY GEOMETRY. A MANUAL OF DRAFTING INSTRUMENTS AND OPERATIONS.** By S. Edw. Warren, C.E. With plates. New York: John Wiley & Son. Pp. 162, 116.

The first of these compact text-books treats of elementary conic sections, and the second includes the æsthetics of drawing scientifically considered. They are clear and excellent hand-books for the pupil in graphic geometry. They will promote neatness and accuracy in a branch of education commonly considered quite aside from science, requiring only dexterity of execution.

CULTURE AND RELIGION IN SOME OF THEIR RELATIONS. By J. C. Shairp, Princ. Coll. St. Salv. and St. Leon. Univ., St. Andrews. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Pp. 197.

These five lectures, delivered in a Scotch college, deserve all the praise they have received in the American reprint. In a style so unassuming that many who read a little may undervalue his work, Principal Shairp analyzes culture itself, as contradistinguished from religion, and then Huxley's scientific theory of it, and Matthew Arnold's literary theory, proceeding thereafter to set forth the obstacles created by intellectual pursuits to spiritual growth, and the happy effect of embodying culture in religion, as part of it. He aims to disarm and destroy the mischievous antagonism attempted to be set up between the two by such spiritual "Philistines" as the late Oxford Professor of Poetry and the plausible, but unsound, lecturer before the Royal Institution. And he effectually does it. The distinctions are well taken, and quietly, but firmly, pressed, the illustrations are unusually good, and the whole production is fresh, elevating, pure, and strong above the majority of books on such topics. Such errors as we note are hardly worth mentioning. It would be a happy thing if some of the good men who order volumes by the quantity for theological students, would include this modest and genuine little book in their list, and then include all our college students among their beneficiaries. It would be good seed in good soil, emphatically.

A COPIOUS AND CRITICAL ENGLISH-LATIN DICTIONARY. By William Smith, LL.D., and Theophilus D. Hall, M.A. New York: Harper & Brothers. Pp. 964.

The Messrs. Harper have recently issued a long-announced and much-needed English-Latin Dictionary, edited chiefly by Dr. William Smith, whose name has become a household word with classical students, and whose industry and versatility are most marvelous.

The exterior of the book is inviting, being tastefully and — what is better — strongly bound. As we open it we are struck by its superiority in plan over the old English-Latin dictionaries commonly in use. This is not surprising, for their defects have been great and long-felt. It has been well nigh impossible for a student depending upon them to write idiomatic Latin. If any one doubts this, let him listen to the salutatories and exercises in "Prose Composition" in our colleges and academies. We fancy Cicero attending one of our Commencements and listening to the opening speech, with its medley of words and idioms drawn from every period of Roman literature, ante-classical, classical, and post classical. His look of surprise gradually gives way to wrath, until, goaded to desperation, he leaps to his feet and shouts to the unlucky Latinist: "*Quousque tandem abutere patientia nostra!*"

In the work before us the English words and their Latin equivalents are carefully classified. Synonyms in Latin are briefly explained. The difference between English and Latin is pointed out and illustrated by examples,

so that the student need no longer commit the blunder of translating literally into Latin phrases peculiar to his mother tongue.

A happy thought in the editors is the use of different kinds of type to make prominent to the eye the various divisions of the subject. The very obvious advantage of this will be appreciated by those who have had to grope through the mazes of similar works in German.

Another feature which pleases us is the translation of the Latin passages quoted. This enhances their value ten fold, since experience has taught us that the student generally will not, and often can not — judiciously — translate them for himself.

We earnestly recommend this to those who make our classical grammars and dictionaries.

We should have been glad to find exact citations of passages throughout the book, since it enables the student to turn at once to the Latin author and see for himself whether the word or phrase *really* translates the English. It seems that this plan did not occur to the editors at first, but was adopted later.

Whether the plan of the work has been judiciously carried out in every particular, can be learned only after long use. If there are some errors and omissions, those can be charitable who know the enormous and tedious labor required to produce such a book — almost *de novo*. Dr. Smith and his associates have again laid us under deep obligations.

**FIRST LESSONS IN COMPOSITION.** By J. S. Host, LL.D., New Jersey State Normal School. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Bro. Pp. 144.

Words, Sentence-making, Variety of Expression, Figurative Expression and Punctuation are treated in elaborate elementary detail. Such books show forcibly what the drill of a *thorough* teacher in the simple beginnings of literary walk should be.

**THE AMERICAN CARDINAL.** New York: Dodd & Mead. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 313. \$1.50.

The anonymous author of this book, under the guise of fiction, sets forth in a feeble way the conflict between Popery and Protestantism, and especially the wiles of the Je-u-its. The scenes described transpired during the late war, and the hero of the story is an Episcopal clergyman, who abandoned his family to become a Romish priest. The real facts are stranger than this fiction.

**HEIGHTS AND DEPTHS.** By Agnes Leonard Scanland. Chicago: Henry A. Sumner. Pp. 271. \$1.50.

This is a Chicago book, gotten up in a style of printing and binding which does credit to the enterprising publisher, and the Lakeside Printing Co. But we can not say much for the contents of the book. It is one of a multitude of goodish books which are soon forgotten.

**THEODORE: A STORY ABOUT BAPTISM.** By a True Baptist. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 374. \$1.25.

Few books upon Baptism have had so wide a circulation and so great influence with the young and uneducated as "Theodosia," published by the Bapt'st Publishing Society. It presents in a plausible but, to a thoughtful and intelligent mind, very unsatisfactory manner, the arguments for Immersion and Close Communion.

"Theodore" is evidently written as an answer to "Theodosia," and makes very easy work of converting a Baptist over to Pedo-Baptist views. It is a very good antidote to the former book, and is a good book to put into the hands of those who will not read more elaborate treatises on this subject.

**WESTWARD: A TALE OF AMERICAN EMIGRANT LIFE.** By Mrs. J. McNair Wright. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 272. \$1.00.

A graphic story of the experiences of a Christian family in their emigration to Kansas and beyond. It professes to be mainly a record of facts, and well illustrates the privations and hardships of pioneer life, and especially how much good a single Christian family may do by their personal influence, and their self-denying efforts to plant the Sabbath-school and the Church on the frontiers. Is an attractive book for Sunday-school libraries.

**THE WAY LOST AND FOUND.** A Book for the Young, and especially Young Men. By Rev. Joseph F. Tuttle, D.D., President of Wabash College. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. Pp. 286. \$1.00.

This is an excellent book; just such as we would be glad to see put into the hands of every young man. The aim is well expressed in the preface, "to win the young to a life of virtue and happiness by winning them to the Cross." President Tuttle evidently understands the peculiar dangers to which the young are exposed, and is a wise and sympathizing counselor to them in their needs. The more of such books the better.

**THE SILVER SONG.** A Choice Collection of New Sabbath-School Music. By W. A. Ogden. Toledo, Ohio: W. W. Whitney. Pp. 176.

THE ROUND TABLE.

---

PHASES OF SKEPTICISM.—All skepticism calls for pity, some for special tenderness and forbearance, and some for a certain kind of respect. If we accept our Saviour's declaration, we must hold that error of the head springs from error of the heart. But with differing degrees of willfulness and defiance.

Most of all, perhaps, we compassionate the *speculative* doubter. It is some men's infirmity, as Bishop Butler has remarked, to be led astray, not by their passions so much as by their speculations. There are men who are forever asking questions that they can not answer; who see all the difficulties and objections far better than the reasons and proofs. Such men are always tossing and find no rest. They are to be pitied.

The *ignorant* infidel deserves tenderness. He knows not what he opposes. It is his fault, and it is also his misfortune. Such was mostly the class of men whom Dr. Nelson encountered, many of whom his persevering kindness recovered.

The *learned* skeptic often deserves special consideration. He has explored like Huxley among natural laws till he loses sight of the law-giver; he has dealt with sensuous things till he has lost sight of the supersensuous; and has been unfortunate, perhaps, in the class of Christian teachers whom he has encountered. Or like Buckle he has plodded among the forces and uniformities of history till the chaos or coincidence of facts has hidden from him the guiding hand divine. Or he has spent his life in elaborating the difficulties of religion and the objections to Christianity, till his sight is confused. We respect his learning and acuteness; we pity his perplexity; and the more because the whole surrounding atmosphere of his life has been that of doubt and cavil.

The *sentimental and moral* skeptic of modern times has a kind of claim to consideration for the high culture and morality which he teaches, so different from the ribaldry and debauchery of early English Deism. It would be a manlier thing in him to acknowledge whence he borrowed his ethics.

One occasionally recognizes a sort of surly frankness in some forms of *scoffing* and *railing* skepticism. It strikes with all its might, confessing the greatness of its foe. You have that sort of feeling toward it that you have for a vicious mastiff.

There has been at times a *fanatical* skepticism, which even commands a quasi respect. It has fought with the Bible and the Church because they were too slow for its reformatory schemes, and philanthropic zeal. The

chief mark of its real character has usually been its terrific bitterness; a *general* bitterness, well illustrated by Mr. Garrison when on the Fourth of July, 1842 (we think it was), he stood up in the Methodist church at Andover, Mass., and expressed the hope "that the lightnings of heaven would blast Bunker Hill monument." We heard and remembered.

But there is a species of skepticism in regard to which it is impossible to entertain one atom of tenderness, consideration, or respect. It is this: When a man claiming knowledge enough of literature, civilization, and history to have preached to a Unitarian church and to edit a "Review" can so far fly in the face not only of common decency, but of common sense and the common judgment of mankind, including its master minds religious, non-religious, and irreligious,—Rousseaus, Parkers, Carlyles,—Jeffersons, Websters, Napoleons,—Bacons, Newtons, Pascals alike; and so far defy the evidences written all over the earth in the tremendous ascendancy of Jesus Christ and His words and works through the literature, civilization, and history of the nations, till the skeptic can not even date his article except from the birth of Christ, and his *prodigious personal potency at this hour over some million souls*,—as to call Jesus Christ "the Nazarene fanatic;" to say that "there was no reason whatever for assuming that he was a great man," that He "gave neither impulse nor direction to the movements made in His name," that in His chief claims He was marked by a "gross lack of good sense," "extreme narrowness of understanding and exceptional ignorance," that "Jesus was many grades below the better class of His time, and was separated from Judaic good sense and character by that narrowness of understanding and blindness of ignorant opinion which in all ages characterize vagrant fanaticism;" that He was "the crude and harsh Jesus," with a "depth of ethical ignorance and heedless unconcern about absolute justice and mercy," and "a heathen ignorance of theistic truth,"—and much more of the same sort.

We may add that the inexcusableness of this erudition is deepened by the assumption throughout that the Gospel narrative gives a correct account at least of Christ's claims.

Now it is idle for the newspapers to waste breath in advertising this spiteful reviling or its author. As a daily paper well said, this is not "smart;" "it is simply stupid." It is intellectual as well as moral drivel. To write in that strain does not attain to the dignity of being Satanic; it is only foolish. It is about as brilliant as profane swearing. It may be termed *asinine* skepticism.

THE MINISTRY PERISHING; OR NOT?—One of the stock "Atlantic" writers told a story in Mr. F. E. Abbot's Toledo "Index," not long since, of a New England D.D., who said the ministry had been living for fifty years on the prestige of Puritan days; that this is nearly worn out, and that in fifty years more it will be "impossible for a man of mediocre talent to sustain himself in the ministry." A Swedenborgian journal takes up the strain, and predicts that the time is coming when there will be almost no

order of ministers at all, though as much religious teaching as now, but the majority will take up the business temporarily, or as a mere Sunday recreation from other occupations. "Unless some change is effected, or some reaction takes place, the ministry will lose the little power it now has, and will fail of support as a distinct class."

There is a certain sublime disregard, in these predictions, of the steady and grand increase of Christian churches, and of the fact that higher education and accomplishments are steadily required of those who preach the Gospel, that interests us. Commend us for solecisms to the men of daring invention! If a man is bent upon contradicting the logic of reason and the logic of events at one stroke, let it be done with a positive and reckless freedom! The confidence of these two outsiders as to the approaching end of Christ's chief institution for His Church, led us to look with solicitude into the Report of our American Education Society just received. We were measurably reassured. The end is *not yet*. The number of theological students assisted by that most benevolent and patriotic organization is still — as ever since the Rebellion — in excess of the number of college students aided. Two hundred and one theological students to one hundred and fifty-two in colleges. A theological education costs more than it did, and the churches help all but eighty-eight of those seeking it. This while they are endowing and improving the seminaries themselves. And the whole number of young men in the seminaries in 1871 is two hundred and eighty-nine, against two hundred and forty in 1870. We breathe easier! Nearly a hundred new students for the ministry applied to the Education Society during the year past. We take courage. We shall watch next year, to see how, or if, the Unitarian and Swedenborgian prediction takes effect upon our Congregational ministry, and perhaps, if it is not entirely blotted out of mind, for a few years thereafter. When we see Park Street and Central Church, in Boston, and the Tabernacle, New York, and the Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, depending on lay preachers, or calling short-course men from the city missions and the frontiers, we shall begin to think there is something in it. As long as the multiplying of such men for ordinary and destitute fields only makes more accomplished preachers more necessary for the great centers of civilization, we shall not be much disturbed for ourselves. And as long as other denominations build new theological schools, and an enthusiastic Methodist even gives one of them \$100,000 for the theological education of women, we shall not be much concerned for the "order" elsewhere. It is likely long to outlast the prophets of its extinction.

A FORGOTTEN AMERICAN AUTHOR — *Apropos* of the new and noble edition of the works of Bishop Berkeley, published at Oxford, and edited by Prof. A. C. Fraser, Sir William Hamilton's successor at Edinburgh, the "British Quarterly" makes the point that England has treated her great philosophical thinkers and writers very shabbily. The Cambridge edition of Bacon, and this of Berkeley, are the only good annotated editions of any of



them. Locke and Hume are yet to be "done." The writer seems to forget Hamilton's edition of Reid. But he exhumes, in passing, an American author, of whom we will give what he says in his own words. He is describing Berkeley's life at Newport:

"One American friend is more closely related to Berkeley than any other. This was Dr. Samuel Johnson, the Episcopalian minister at Stratford. He had known 'The Principles of Human Knowledge' before Berkeley's arrival in America, and had become a convert to the metaphysical principles there set forth. He was one of the first to welcome Berkeley when he landed in Rhode Island, and the friendship and correspondence which then began only ceased with the death of the Bishop. His name, too, possesses special interest to all students of Berkeley's philosophy, and he must be held in honor as *one of the earliest and one of the greatest metaphysicians which America has produced*. Although his works have been forgotten — obscured, perhaps, by the theological and metaphysical fame of his great pupil, Jonathan Edwards — they still deserve attention. We should like to see a new edition of his 'Elementa Philosophica;' and believe that if republished and known, it would be a valuable contribution to American philosophy. It \* \* was the result of the study of Berkeley's writings, and of conversations and correspondence with him on the philosophical subjects it discusses. It was dedicated to the Bishop, and may almost be looked upon as a new and more complete edition of 'The Principles of Human Knowledge.' It treats of the pure intellect and its notions, and of the intuitive intellectual light; and so, to some extent, supplies the place of the second part of that work which was never written, and connects the philosophy of Berkeley's earlier days with the platonic mysticism of his old age. Johnson's 'Elementa Philosophica' can never be separated from Berkeley's 'Principles of Human Knowledge;' and had the two been always studied together, the continual misapprehension of the Bishop's philosophical system, which has characterized most histories of philosophy, could scarcely have arisen. The philosophical letters to Johnson are also full of interest, and show other sides of Berkeley's system than that most prominent in the 'Principles of Human Knowledge;' and Johnson himself seems to have had no small influence in developing what, in some respects, may be called the idealist, and in others the mystical, moment in Berkeley's speculation."

The ordinary memoirs of Pres. Edwards are so meager as to furnish no data for judging how much he was indebted to Johnson or Berkeley for the stimulation of philosophical thought. He entered Yale College in 1715, remaining there till 1722, when he went to New York. He returned to New Haven in 1723 as tutor, and resigned his tutorship September, 1726. Berkeley seems to have come to Newport (on his way to Bermuda) in 1721, and remained there till the close of 1731. Chambers says 1735. His "Theory of Vision" was published 1709 — his "Principles," 1710. His "Three Dialogues," 1713; his "Minute Philosopher," 1732. We should like to know more of Edwards' studies in Berkeleyanism, and in what sense he was

a pupil of Dr. Samuel Johnson, the Episcopal minister at Stratford. The relations of the places, Stratford and New Haven, are obvious enough; we want to know much more of those of the men, but shall not be gratified, probably, till Prof. Park gives us his *Memoir of Edwards*—a fitting companion to his two other great biographies, those of Hopkins and Emmons. *Such* an account of Edwards' habits of study, the books he read early and read most, his judgments upon them, and of the history of his wonderful mind, as we have of Sir William Hamilton's in Prof. Veitch's *Memoir*, would be of priceless value. Why is the world yet defrauded of it?

But, meantime, we second the "British Quarterly's" call for a new and modern edition—properly prepared and annotated—of the writings of the forgotten Stratford rector. Let us see how much Berkeley was indebted to him, and how much he was to Berkeley. Give us the materials for judging what both had to do with forming the opinions of Edwards. An edition of Johnson's philosophical works was published in London, edited by Smith, of Philadelphia. Some American publisher can exhume it, and a new edition should issue in America. Meanwhile, we hope English scholars and publishers will do late justice to another of their—very few—philosophical bishops, Joseph Butler, some time Lord Bishop of Durham. He specially deserves to be extricated from implications of utilitarianism in morals which have been laid upon him. Berkeley hints in the "AdVERTISEMENT" to "*Aleiphron*," that virtue is "likely to suffer less from its witty antagonists, than from its tender nurses who are apt \* \* \* to make it a mercenary thing by talking so much of its rewards," and among these last Butler has often been strangely counted.

**WOMAN'S RIGHTS IN FRANCE.**—What a wonderful city is Paris, whether to make a fashion or a revolution, "to point a moral or adorn a tale." For eighty years has her first Bible-hating Revolution illustrated the whole dark side of Biblical theology. She has shown forth incontrovertibly the awful possibilities of human depravity, and the powerlessness of all taste, culture and social bonds when they stand in its path. In the career of her first Napoleon she exhibited the ultimate imbecility of the brightest executive and military genius the world has seen, when bent on selfish ends; in that of her last Napoleon, the folly of the craftiest; and in both how swift the plunge of insane ambition from the pinnacle to the gulf! Practically without the Christian family, the Christian Sabbath and the Christian's God, she has shown to the world their absolute indispensableness to true patriotism, civil freedom, or natural stability. Pledged to a godless "liberty, equality and fraternity," she has attained at intervals unto despotism, oligarchy and diabolism.

Here originated, eighty years ago, the theory that there is nothing naturally feminine in the adaptations of woman; and here, too, the Lord has shown how far woman can sink, though in the very center of refinement, when the strong arm of Christian protection and *shelter* are withdrawn from her life; and how, when thrust forth, as a man is thrust, into the rudest

buffetings of life and the onset of vice, she can become as bad of heart, as shameless of life, and as ferocious of deed as any man. Witness the long reign of "free-love" in Paris — its *demi-monde* more than half its world — its queens of vice enthroned queens of fashion by female votes — its illegitimate more numerous than its legitimate children. And now behold in the late convulsions of Paris the doctrine of indiscriminate functions of the sexes pushed to its extreme logical issue in the rioting, soldiering, massacring, shooting and being shot, of the women indiscriminately with the men. Women went round Paris pouring petroleum and throwing matches into the cellars. Women murdered hostages and suspected persons. Young women whose appearance indicated intelligence and refinement, we are told, "fought like tigers" in defense of the Commune, and of course were shot like tiger-cats. One handsome hag treacherously killed an officer and three soldiers before she herself was riddled with bullets. A battalion of "Amazons of the Commune" was organized, twenty-five hundred strong, and reviewed by two general officers in the court of the Tuileries on the 16th of May. They let themselves be shot at thirty cents a day, besides clothing and rations. Cheap food for powder that! "Ten thousand," it is said, "might have been readily had on the same terms." Of course they received no more quarter than other fighters. "To this, however," says the "Independent," "no consistent advocate of the rights of women could object." But it is fittest to set a man a-thinking; and one thought put by the "Congregationalist" is, "What becomes of the plea that woman would refine politics and assuage war"? It is well to put these things on record, as food for thought.

We concede to woman, in *Christian society, rightly constituted*, the refining and elevating influence. But it is only there and thus. When she ceases to be sheltered in the Christian home — yea, when she ceases to be protected by the strong arms of her ruder, rougher father, brothers, husband, sons, from the influences which form their own temptation, then she ceases to exert that influence. Without that shelter she is as much, if not more, in danger than man himself. These are words of truth and soberness, which can be abundantly maintained from all history. They will bear pondering by men — and women, too. If woman is to be a divinity, she must dwell in a sanctuary.

PEACE AND POWDER. — Gunpowder sometimes becomes the ultimate peace argument. Back of right must evermore lie might. So the Peace Society at length viewed the case when it called our million soldiers a great national police sent South. A good dodge, both wise and timely.

The same argument was sadly persuasive on the 12th of July in New York. It is a pity that through military blundering so many innocent lives were lost. But many hundred other lives were saved. It is ever the curse of these mob demonstrations, that from beginning to end they involve the innocent with the guilty, in suffering.

What an absurd plea that for Orangemen to parade is not a right, but a

privilege. It is a privilege too long and too universally conceded in this land to be retracted now at a wild Irish howl. The privilege to parade peacefully through the public streets has been as free as to breathe the air; for Irish, German, Scandinavian, boot-blacks, news-boys and Fisk's regiment, temperance men and lager beer men, little fellows with paper caps and little drums, and Odd-Fellows with pretty sashes and little aprons, Democrats and Republicans with smoking torches and brimstone mottoes. It sometimes hurts our feelings to behold their saucy mottoes and saucy manners; it pains us to see the soldiers sweating so in bear-skin caps on a July day, and to see the "Sir Knights" look so ridiculous in their "regalia,"—but we bear it; yea, we often "grin and bear it." So must our Irish friends, whether the Connaught men, the Far-downers, Orangemen or Catholics. It comes to be simply a question of government and order. Peaceful processions must be protected—peacefully if possible, but powerfully and, if need be, powderfully too, and that not with blank cartridges. Blank cartridges have cost a multitude of lives. Napoleon the First knew how to manage a mob. His method has never been improved upon.

**SUNDAY LAWS.**—The Sunday question is up in good earnest in Cincinnati. It follows close upon the Bible question. What with these and the free-liquor, and the free-love, and the suffrage, and the labor, and the Chinese, and the Irish, and the Romish questions, the present generation will have its hands full.

Our foreign friends have a queer way of taking refuge under the shelter of our institutions, and then devoting themselves at their earliest convenience to the destruction of our institutions. They flee from the old country and then do their best to drag us down to the level of the old country. Our Irish fellow-citizens insist on the free fights of Tipperary, and our continental friends on crushing the Bible and the Christian Sabbath, the very lack of whose sweet influences make their countrymen at home incapable of liberty. The wonderful vitality of our institutions and the greatness of their foundations appear in the fact that we have quietly swallowed and digested such an immense mass of foreign poison, and still lived and flourished. Should they accomplish their end, they will prove to be killers of the golden-egged goose; if we suffer it, we shall be worthy of the name—and the fate.

**BUSINESS AND BOOKS.**—The question has lately forced itself much on our minds whether our Christian laymen interest themselves enough in the themes that do not lie directly in the line of business life. Such topics, for example, as constitute the staple of our best religious reviews; the themes that agitate the religious world in controversy with skeptics; literary and scientific questions; and even the institutions vitally related to their own church communions, beyond their particular churches. How very few of the laymen practically care for these things.

Is it not the gravest error? Do they not miss the highest functions, as

well as the best enjoyment, of intelligent Christianity? Do they not fail of the truest use of their business capacity, their practical sense, and their wealth too?

The thing is possible and feasible. A prosperous business certainly should afford leisure, for we have known the closest pressure still to leave time for culture. There are men who in the very midst of business cares do not forget the realm of thought. It is often the case that such men form the best jury before which to bring the current topics of discussion. We know business men who give their leisure, perhaps, to some special department, not forgetful of the rest. We knew one gentleman who, for the Christian pleasure of it, had learned to read his Greek Testament in mature years, and was contemplating the question of the Hebrew Bible. We do not mention it as a course that would be wise for others, but to show what a man can do.

Out of this lack of reading habits grows much of the indifference of laymen to colleges, theological seminaries, and denominational movements. They say, practically, "We do not care for all this — it is your hobby." Now, if it was because they were so heavenly-minded, the case would be difficult. But we think they will hardly claim that.